DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 352 24 CG 006 770

AUTHOR Valine, Warren J.
TITLE Focused Feedback With Video Tape As An Aid In Counseling Underachieving College Freshmen. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Georgia Southwestern Coll., Americus , Ga.
SPONS AGENCY National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/CE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO BR-0-D-004
PUB DATE Jul 70
GRANT OEG-4-70-0008(057)
NOTE 97p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Counseling; *Counseling Effectiveness; *Feedback; *Group Counseling; Groups; *Video Tape Recordings

ABSTRACT

This study examines the relative effectiveness of 3 group counseling techniques and a control group in counseling with underachieving college freshmen. The effectiveness of each method was determined through comparison of grade point averages (GPA) as well as by pre- and post-test scores on selected self concept variables of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Seventy-three students were randomly placed in one of the 4 groups: (1) Immediate Feedback via videotape; (2) Delayed Feedback via videotape; (3) Non Video; and (4) control. Results reveal no significant differences either on GPA or on measured self concept variables with one exception. Participant responses on a Student Evaluation Questionnaire, however, were generally favorable to the use of videotape in group counseling. Suggestions for further research are made. (TL)

ED056352

BR-0-D-004 PA 24
OC-NCERD

FINAL REPORT

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: CG EM
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

PROJECT NO. 0-D-004
GRANT NO. OEG-4-70-0008(057)

WARREN J. VALINE
GEORGIA SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE
AMERICUS, GEORGIA 31709

Focused Feedback With Video Tape As An Aid In Counseling Underachieving College Freshmen

July 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

National Center For Educational Research and Development

(Regional Research Program)

ED 006 770

ED056352

ABSTRACT

WARREN JAMES VALINE

Focused Feedback With Video Tape As An Aid In Counseling Underachieving College Freshmen

This study was an effort to determine the relative effectiveness of three counseling techniques as compared to a control group in group counseling with underachieving college freshmen. The effectiveness of a method was determined through comparison of the Grade Point Average and selected self-concept variables among four groups. Self-concept was measured using the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Five hypotheses were tested.

The subjects were drawn from the 1969 entering Freshman Class of 548 students at Georgia Southwestern College. Students whose SAT verbal scores were above the class mean and whose high school averages were below the class mean were included in the study. Out of a potential of 95 students, 73 made up the sample for the study.

Three treatment groups and a control group were selected on a basis of random numbers. Pre- and posttests were administered to all Ss using the TSCS and the EPPS. The Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes was also administered as a pretest only.

The groups were designated as Immediate Feedback (IF), Delayed Feedback (DF), Non Video (NV), and Control. Group N's were 17, 18, 18, and 20 respectively. The IF group viewed video replays of group member behavior during the counseling session. The DF group viewed selected replays of group member behavior at the beginning of the session following the video taping. The NV group experienced counseling without the intervention of video tape. Ten counseling sessions were conducted during the Fall Quarter for each of the groups.

The null hypothesis of no significant differences on GPA and measured self-concept variables could not be rejected in each case with the exception of the Intraception variable on the EPPS. However, Duncan's Multiple Range Test failed to discriminate between the groups in identifying which ones were in fact different.

Visual inspection of the group profiles for the TSCS pre- and posttests showed some changes in self-concept variables in both positive and negative directions, but total group change was slight. Inspection of individual profiles showed individuals changing in opposite directions that in effect seemed to cancel out group change.

No significant difference was indicated in the GPA for the groups. However, the trend was in favor of the Immediate Feedback group. The IF group attained its Predicted Freshman Average Grade and was the only group that showed an increase in GPA from the Fall to the Spring Quarter.

Non statistical measures included a Student Evaluation Questionnaire and withdrawals from college. The Questionnaire responses indicated a generally favorable impression of the use of Video Tape in group counseling. Although objective data did not measure significant change occurring, student responses indicated video tape was helpful to individuals within the group. No detrimental effects were evident. Suggestions for further research are made.

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 0-D-004
Grant No. OEG-4-70-0008 (057)

FOCUSED FEEDBACK WITH VIDEO TAPE AS AN AID IN COUNSELING UNDERACHIEVING COLLEGE FRESHMEN

Warren J. Valine, Ph.D.

Georgia Southwestern College

Americus, Georgia

July 31, 1970

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
National Center for Educational Research and Development

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Any undertaking of this nature involves too many people for one to express individual appreciation. However, a special word of thanks is given to:

The administration of Georgia Southwestern College, specifically Dr. William B. King, President, and Dr. William Roark, Dean of Student Services, who granted the many hours needed to perform the study.

Dr. George M. Gazda who acted as consultant throughout the entire study.

Dr. Joseph C. Bledsoe for the many hours he gave in assisting with the statistical analysis.

Dr. Lewis Lieberman who wrote the computer program and provided use of the computer.

The late Dr. Frederick Stoller for valuable direction in the early stages of the study.

Dr. William Fitts for his analysis of the TSCS data.

Mrs. Paula Blankenship for the many hours of typing in the early and final manuscript.

Mrs. Louise Valine, the author's wife, for many valuable suggestions, for proof reading the manuscript, and for her constant patience, understanding and encouragement throughout the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Acknowledgments . . . . . .

List of Tables . . . . . .

List of Figures . . . . . .

Chapter

1. Introduction 1

Significance 1

The Problem 3

Statement of Hypotheses 3

Conceptual Hypothesis 3

Null Hypothesis 3

Limitations 4

Definition of Terms 4

Review of the Literature 5

Identity of the Underachiever 5

Group Counseling Techniques 7

Video Tape Feedback 10

Summary of Literature Review 11

2. Instruments Used in the Study 13

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale 13

The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule 15

The Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes 16

3. Procedures 18

Subjects 18

Definition of Sample 18

Research Design 18

Page

Selection of Sample 18

Selection of Groups 18

Treatment 20

Pre- and Posttest Measures 20

Procedure with Video Tape in the Group 21

Student Evaluation Questionnaire 22

Analysis of the Data 23

4. Results 25

Statistical Data 25

Analysis of Variance on GPA 25

Analysis of Covariance on TSCS 25

Analysis of Covariance on EPPS 25

Duncan's Multiple Range Test 25

Non-Statistical Data 26

Student Evaluation Questionnaire 26

Withdrawal From School 26

5. Conclusions and Implications for Further Research . . . 46

Research Objective 46

Trends of Results 46

Analysis of Hypotheses 46

Analysis of Student Responses 48

Analysis of EPPS Results 49

Analysis of TSCS Results 49

Implications for Further Research 51

References 52

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Occupations of Ss Parents	19
2	Description of Groups	19
3	Average Group Attendance	20
4	Group N's for Pre- and Posttests of TSCS and EPPS . . .	21
5	Description of Video Feedback in Groups	23
6	Types of Responses in Video Feedback in Groups	23
7	Comparison of Fall and Spring Quarter GPA's among Groups with Students who Remained at Georgia Southwestern College All Year	26
8	Comparison of PFAG and Cumulative GPA's among Groups with Students who Remained at Georgia Southwestern College All Year	26
9	Means, Standard Deviations and F Values on the TSCS Pre- and Posttests	27
10	Error Mean Square and F Values for the Four Groups On Pre- and Posttests for the 29 TSCS Variables	31
11	Multiple Range Test: Self Criticism Variable on TSCS Pretest	33
12	Results of Multiple Range Test: Self Criticism Variable on TSCS Pretest	33
13	Multiple Range Test: Self Criticism Variable on TSCS Posttest	34
14	Results of Multiple Range Test: Self Criticism Variable on TSCS Posttest	34
15	Pretest and Posttest F Values and Within-groups and Between-Means r's for the 29 TSCS Variables	35
16	Means Standard Deviations and F Values on the EPPS Pre- and Posttests	37

Table		Page
17	Error Mean Square and F Values for the Four Groups on Pre- and Posttests for the 15 EPPS Variables	39
18	Multiple Range Test: Intraception Variable on EPPS Pretest	40
19	Results of Multiple Range Test: Intraception Variable on EPPS Pretest	40
20	Multiple Range Test: Intraception Variable on EPPS Posttest	41
21	Results of Multiple Range Test: Intraception Variable on EPPS Posttest	41
22	Multiple Range Test: Intraception Variable on EPPS Covariance	42
23	Questionnaire Item Response Distribution	43
24	Reasons for Withdrawal From College	44
25	Reasons for Withdrawal From College by Groups	45

List of Figures

Figure		Page
1	Individual Profile: Immediate Feedback Group	73
2	Individual Profile: Immediate Feedback Group	74
3	Individual Profile: Delayed Feedback Group	75
4	Individual Profile: Delayed Feedback Group	76
5	Individual Profile: Non Video Group	77
6	Individual Profile: Non Video Group	78
7	Individual Profile: Control Group	79
8	Individual Profile: Control Group	80
9	Group Mean Profile: Immediate Feedback Group	82
10	Group Mean Profile: Delayed Feedback Group	83
11	Group Mean Profile: Non Video Group	84
12	Group Mean Profile: Control Group	85

Page

Appendices

A. Letters to Students 61

B. Protocol 65

C. Student Evaluation Questionnaire 70

D. TSCS Individual Profiles 72

E. TSCS Group Profile. 81

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The presence of the underachiever in college is well established in research (Bednar & Weinberg, 1970; Brown, 1969; Combs, 1964; Drake, 1962; Malloy, 1954; Serwer & Levy, 1966; Wellington, 1965). Once failure is experienced with regularity it becomes a pattern that is difficult to break (Shaw & McCuen, 1960). Glasser (1969) pointed out that educators at all levels are trying new approaches to the problem of failure in students who in elementary school have developed a self-concept of themselves as failures. The feeling of defeat and consequent lack of confidence grows. Shaw and McCuen (1960) showed that the underachiever in the eleventh grade had also received lower grades than achievers in the first grade. If this pattern has been established in the public schools, it seems it will be augmented in the competitive environment of the college.

Research indicates a progressive development of the underachiever (Barrett, 1957; Frankel, 1960). College freshmen who have not performed up to their potential in high school would have a tendency to continue this pattern in college.

Significance

In a number of reported studies with underachievers many underlying factors seem to lead to what Roth (1967) called the Non-achievement syndrome. Hafner(1967) stated, "Personality deviations can interfere with the ability to concentrate and the ability to concentrate may well be the sine qua non of reading and study endeavors" (p. 147). The pattern developed in these students needs to be changed. Ohlsen (1960) in his work with gifted underachievers in group counseling to help them better understand themselves said, "All of this takes time--these changes come ever so gradually--yet they must precede substantial improvement in grades" (p. 109). Gazda (1968a) stressed that the group member must have a voluntary attitude toward change and must be open or genuine in his approach if he is to benefit from a group counseling experience. Gazda wrote, "The fact is that the author considers the need to be open or genuine one of the basic motivating forces operating within clients who are seeking to improve their adjustment" (p. 269).

Students who may feel a threat in facing the experience of college may also hesitate to seek help; yet they might welcome it if it were offered in a non-threatening setting. Such a setting can be created in a group counseling experience. Wright (1959) stated,

> Research to date supports a belief in the potential of multiple (group) counseling. Continued evaluation of this process in various settings may well indicate a need to reorient thinking relative to the practice of complete reliance on individual counseling (p. 557).

In a review of the literature on group procedures between 1953 and 1963 Shaw and Wurston (1965) found that many studies were conducted with inadequate controls and statistical procedures. However, most studies reported successful outcomes in spite of these weaknesses. It is questionable whether outcomes were actually successful or whether inappropriate procedures allowed successful results to be reported. It was suggested that group procedures offered some means of increasing effectiveness and the size of the population one can reach, but that more rigorous attempts to study the procedures are necessary.

Gazda and Larsen (1968) reviewed 104 group-counseling studies reported in the literature between 1938 and 1967. The basic conclusion they reached was that "group counseling research is inconclusive" (p. 64).

Bednar and Weinberg (1970) reviewed 23 studies in individual and group counseling. They found that of 14 studies using group counseling 9 showed significant improvement in Grade Point Average (GPA) while 2 of 7 studies using individual counseling reported a significant improvement. Bednar and Weinberg (1970) stated that, "From the standpoint of economy as well as effectiveness group counseling appears to hold more promise as a treatment method than individual counseling methods or academic study courses" (p. 6).

Brown (1969) indicated that the anxiety level of the underachiever determined how he would respond in a group. He found that high anxiety underachievers benefited more from an unstructured group approach whereas the low anxiety underachiever preferred a structured environment that did not encourage open discussion of feelings.

Recent innovation in group counseling includes the use of video tape. Several studies have been reported using video tape in a variety of settings with groups (Czajkoski, 1968; Danet, 1968; Martin, 1969; Poling, 1968; Walz & Johnson, 1963). Other studies are still in process.

It is not known to what extent, if any, that video tape may interfere with the group process. Positive results that may occur making the intrusion of video tape feedback worth while are unkown. Answers to these and other pertinent questions are needed.

The increasing demand for methods and procedures that will aid the student in his academic role challenges the counselor. Technology continually provides new opportunities to increase the effectiveness of accepted methods.

Problem

The present study is an effort to determine the relative effectiveness of three counseling techniques including video tape feedback compared to a control group in group counseling of underachieving college freshmen. The effectiveness of a counseling method was determined by the S's GPA and selected self-concept variables as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS). Other factors considered were S's withdrawal from courses and/or withdrawal from college.

Focused Feedback as described by Stoller (1967a, 1967b, 1968a, 1968b) was the primary basis for the use of the video tape in the groups. Stoller (1967b) feels that video tape feedback has much to offer the group process.

> Serious use of video tape forces the therapist to explore both in developing thought and techniques, the area of anticipated response in interpersonal conduct. Ultimately it is not a question of the relative merit of the non-verbally mediated self-confrontation. Rather it is a question of expanding the versatility of therapeutic techniques and approaches. Video tape represents an important tool which opens a new area of exploration and brings the individual closer to coming to terms with himself (p. 6).

A conceptual hypothesis for the study was formulated.

> Student encounters with themselves by means of video tape feedback will cause significant changes to take place enabling them to become more productive and more capable of fulfilling their potential.

The following null hypotheses were formulated.

1. There will be no significant difference in GPA and in measured self-concept variables between subjects who receive immediate video tape feedback and those who receive delayed video tape feedback.

2. There will be no significant difference in GPA and in measured self-concept variables between subjects who are counseled and in a setting with video tape feedback and those who are counseled in a setting with no video tape feedback.

3. There will be no significant difference in GPA and in measured self-concept variables between subjects who are counseled with immediate video feedback and those who receive no counseling.

4. There will be no significant difference in GPA and in measured self-concept variables between subjects who are counseled with delayed video tape feedback and those who receive no counseling.

5. There will be no significant difference in GPA and in measured self-concept variables between subjects who receive group counseling without video tape and those who receive no counseling.

Limitations

1. All conclusions drawn from the data of this study can only be generalized within the scope of populations similar to those from which the sample was drawn.

2. The video tape techniques is only one of several employed in attempts to change behavior.

3. The high school averages used in helping to determine under-achievement are to some extent a measure of that particular school's academic program and not entirely a reflection of the student's ability.

4. Self-concept measures such as used in this study, produces only those aspects of one's self that the person is willing to expose.

Definition of Terms

Certain terms in this study are used according to the following definitions.

TSCS Tennessee Self Concept Scale is a one-hundred item instrument designed by William H. Fitts that allows a subject to portray his own picture of himself.

EPPS Edwards Personal Preference Schedule is an instrument designed to measure fifteen personality variables based on a list of needs. presented by H. A. Murray.

SSHA Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes is an instrument designed to assess strengths and weaknesses in a person'a study pattern and his attitudes toward education.

GPA Grade Point Average is used in helping to determine the relative effectiveness of the counseling techniques used.

HA High School Average is a measure used in the determination of an underachiever.

SAT Scholastic Aptitude Test is an objective test designed to measure how well a student has developed the verbal and mathematical skills considered necessary for success in college work.

PFAG Predicted Freshman Average Grade is a measure used in a comparitive study of scholastic attainment of the S's.

FF Focused Feedback is a technique used with video tape. Certain selected segments of video tape are replayed to an individual and/or group for further understanding of a specific behavior.

IF Immediate Feedback is a technique of video tape replay in which the recorded behavior of a person is played back during the counseling session.

DF Delayed Feedback is a technique of video tape replay in which the recorded behavior of a person is played back at some time after the counseling session.

NV Non Video identifies the group that received counseling without the added treatment variable of video tape.

Underachiever In this study an underachiever is defined as one whose SAT score is above the mean of the entering freshman class and whose high school average is below the mean of the class.

Review of Literature

Identity of the Underachiever

The literature pertaining to this study concerns three areas: (1) the identity of the underachiever; (2) group counseling techniques; and (3) video tape feedback. The literature reveals a continuing search for the most effective method for aiding the underachiever in college. The definition of what constitutes an underachiever varies with the investigator (Jackson, 1968). But that colleges continue to enroll students who show academic potential of success, yet who fail to measure up to this potential is well established (Dickenson & Truax, 1966; Gilbreath, 1967; Hart, 1964; Marx, 1959; Roth, 1967; Spielberger, 1962; Spielberger, 1964; Winborn & Schmidt, 1962).

In a pioneer article on low performing students Kirk (1952) pointed out that underachievers are unaware of the reasons for their underachievement and that they are generally uncommunicative in counseling. Drasgow (1957) studied underachievers for a five-year period. He found underachievers were in a curriculum that held little interest for them. The time at which counseling began seemed crucial for success.

> If we began counseling before the client has accepted the idea of failure in his alien course, the probability of our being able to help is small. The client's feelings of failure may appear before, during, or after he has officially failed. The actual feeling of failure may be prerequisite to this type of client's becoming "ready" for counseling (p. 211).

The literature contains several studies that attempt to identify causes of underachievement and differences between the under-and overachiever. Urlinger and Stephens (1960) identified motivation as a factor; Krug (1959) identified need for achievement; Baymur (1960) investigated study habits while Lum (1960) showed that underachievers were indistinguishable from overachievers in the use of effective study habits. Lum further showed that the differences were evident in non-academic areas such as academic drive, procrastination, susceptibility to distracting influences, waste of time as well as criticism of educational methodology and doubts as to

the value of a college education. Roth (1967) identified what he labeled as the Non-achievement Syndrome.

Malloy (1954) found underachieving female college freshmen to be best friends with others who get low grades. They work hard only in subjects they like. They are less persistent and are inclined to select less challenging goals. Drake (1962) confirmed his study of 1956 that showed low achieving male students tend "to be 'defiant, argumentative, cocky, snobbish, aggressive, opinionated or belligerent' as described by counselors" (p. 166).

In a research study with gifted underachievers at the University of Illinois Ohlsen (1960) found characteristics identifying the underachiever to be in agreement with earlier studies by Gowan (1955), Kirk (1952), Drasgow (1957), and Shaw and Grubb (1958). Underachievers tend to be hostile. Their failure is associated with goals that are not theirs. Gowan (1955) had found gifted underachievers to be self-sufficient, unsociable, hard to reach, hard to interest in social activities, indifferent to their responsibilities, and less identified with their parents than other gifted youths. Shaw and Grubb (1958) also found that underachievement is not a surface identity easily modified, and that the demand of others for more and better quality of work had a detrimental effect on underachievers.

Hummel and Sprinthall (1965) found underachievers to be fatalistic in expectations for the outcome of personal efforts. They tend to put a premium on the immediate and practical effects gained from work and are less likely to see long range goals. They are generally more immature than superior achievers. Hummel and Sprinthall (1965) also reported that the achiever will more likely possess the attributes of a mature ego such as self control, personal responsibility, and thoughtful planning to the tasks of living. Serwer and Levy (1966) determined that college underachievers have at least five things in common (1) an inability to control aggressiveness and hostile impulses, (2) a tendency toward emotional coldness and detachment, (3) a compulsive indecision, (4) a difficulty in becoming involved with other people, and (5) a tendency toward dependency. They saw the problem not so much in study habits and educational goals, but in a need to understand feelings that are hindering success.

Combs (1964) found similar traits in a study of eleventh-grade high school males who were academically capable but were underachieving. They saw themselves as inadequate and showed inefficient approaches to problems. They also showed less freedom and adequacy of emotional expressions. Combs stated, "a major determinant of how well one will be able to function is his feeling of capability of functioning" (p. 50).

Evidence seems to indicate that the underachievement pattern begins in early childhood. Shaw and McCuen(1960) showed that the underachiever in the eleventh grade has also received lower grades than achievers in the first grade. This difference was significant at the .01 level by the third grade increasing in significance until grade ten. Barrett (1957) reported that children who functioned below their predicted level in the fifth grade

did even more poorly in secondary school. Frankel (1960) reported that the difference in mean scholastic averages for a group of underachievers was twice as great in high school as it was in junior high school.

As the underachievement pattern is carried into college, it is evident that the student will find it difficult to accomplish the required work unless some intervention causes a disruption of the pattern that has been developed over several years. Lifton (1968) stated,

> Everyone has potentialities for achievement and enjoyment of life beyond his present functioning. Few will change their present functioning unless some agency intervenes and helps them take the time to assess their satisfaction with what is, as contrasted with what could be (p. 245).

Group Counseling Techniques

Gazda (1968a) has provided a definition and history of group counseling. The term "group counseling" seems to have originated with Richard D. Allen an educator during the decades of the 1920's and 1930's. Allen first used the term "group counseling" in an article entitled, "A group guidance curriculum in the senior high school" published in 1931 (Allen, 1931, p. 130). In the article he used the terms case-conference, group guidance and group counseling interchangeably. Little general acceptance of the concept was in evidence however, until after World War II. A variety of terms appeared in textbooks such as Guidance in Groups, Bennett (1955); Group Counseling, Jones (1963); and Multiple Counseling, Froehlich (1947).

Confusion as to what is meant by group counseling seems to be lessening in recent years. Gazda et al. (1967) stated that,

> a recent survey of fifty-four of the most prominent contributors to the field of group counseling for the period 1960 to 1965 revealed that 80 per cent preferred the term group counseling to group guidance, multiple counseling, group therapy, psychodrama, and sociodrama when they were asked to select the term they preferred to use to describe "Counseling with more than one individual simultaneously"(Gazda, Duncan & Meadows, 1967).

In terms of group counseling a group is more than a collection of people. Krech and Crutchfield (1948) have defined a group as

> ...two or more people who bear an explicit psychological relationship to one another. This means that for each member of the group the other members must exist in some more or less immediate psychological way so that their behavior and their characteristics influence him (p. 18).

MacLennan and Felsenfeld (1968) enumerated four purposes for which groups are formed: (1) to provide constructive experience which will assist

the individual to feel differently about himself and others; (2) to give support or to add pressure to the individual's attempt to behave differently; (3) to provide opportunities for the individual to discuss and examine problems which he experiences in all areas of his life, and (4) to give the individual a chance to examine and analyze his impact on others as it is expressed in the group itself (p. 6).

Luchins (1967) differentiated between viewing the group as individuals and viewing individuals as a group regarding how they are to be treated. He felt that a group goal is essential to the success of the group therapy. However, Gazda (1968a) pointed out different types of group process that require individual goals within the group.

> Counseling groups may be described as growth-centered (psyche process) rather than task-centered (socio process), having no group goal as such, but rather each member having an individual general goal of improved adjustment, and the leader's role that of encouraging open discussion of member's needs and feelings and responding in a therapeutic fashion to the feelings of the members (p. 266).

As the therapy of the group works for one person, others become willing to share their needs. A list of values and uniqueness of group counseling found in the literature and reported by Gazda (1968a) point up the advantage of group counseling.

Wolf (1968) spoke of the "microcosmic society" that the group presents. But Bonney and Foley (1963) warn of resistance that may develop in a group if the structure and purpose of the group is not differentiated from society by the leader. They defined a transition stage that must be passed at some early point in the counseling process for therapeutic conditions to be operative. In some manner

> the counselor communicates that personal problems should not be discussed in social groups but that the discussion of personal problems is not only acceptable but also therapeutically necessary in the normatively different context of the counseling situation (p. 138).

Dreikurs (1968) pointed out that in a group the therapist can observe interaction between individuals and need not simply hear about it from the client in a one-to-one setting. Lifton (1968) stressed that some communication in a group comes through silence and nonverbal cues, and it is one of the leader's roles to reflect these cues in order to deal with the problem indicated. In his discussion of Group-Centered Counseling Lifton (1968) stated,

> Counselors have not been equally efficient in their attempts to explore the many other ways in which people can communicate and

> to determine how they can more effectively take advantage of non-verbal communication to facilitate the counseling process (p. 240).

Earlier reference was made to a survey of 54 prominent contributors to the field of group counseling. A further result of the survey by Gazda, Duncan, and Meadows (1967) was a composite definition of counseling that may help unify the variety of attitudes expressed here regarding the group counseling experience.

> Group counseling is a dynamic interpersonal process focusing on conscious thought and behavior and involving the therapy functions of permissiveness, orientation to reality, catharsis, and mutual trust, caring, understanding, acceptance, and support. The therapy functions are created and nurtured in a small group through the sharing of personal concerns with one's peers and the counselor. The group counselees are basically normal individuals with various concerns which are not debilitating to the extent requiring extensive personality change. The group counselees may utilize the group interaction to increase understanding and acceptance of values and goals and to learn and/or unlearn certain attitudes and behaviors (p. 306).

One further quote by Kemp (1964) summarizes a person's phenomenal experience within the group.

> Research findings emphasize that each member brings to the group his past experiences, his attitudes toward problems, and his established methods of working. Especially important is the member's degree of self-esteem and his ability to tolerate ambiguity and to examine issues on the basis of their intrinsic merits. Changes in behavior are preceded by changes in an individual's perception of self; a genuine change requires a total involvement and it takes place more readily when the individual is in a group than when he is alone... One important key to the development of the individual as a useful group member is mutual trust and acceptance (p. 379).

The importance of group interaction is stressed by several writers. In psychodrama there is a unique experience defined as Encounter that takes place. Moreno (1968) said, "Encounter means that two persons do not only meet, but also experience and comprehend one another, each with his whole being"(p. 38). The words "openness" of Gazda (1968a), "confrontation and congruence" of Lifton (1968), "mutual trust and respect" of Sonstegard (1968) as well as other descriptive expressions indicate the importance of participation within a group. At times the group members may play the role of co-counselor either as an appointed task or often as a natural response to the interaction taking place.

Video Tape Feedback

Studies employing the use of video tape are relatively new in research, and are of an exploratory nature to a great extent. In many instances the results are descriptive and no attempt is made to report statistical evidence concerning the effectiveness of the use of video tape in behavioral change.

Video tape has been employed in training with counselors and clinical psychologists. Kagan, Krathwohl and Miller (1963) and Kagan and Krathwohl (1967) reported using video tape as part of a process called Interpersonal Process Recall (IPR). Landsman and Lane (1963) used video tape in role playing in counselor education. Other descriptive reports of uses of video tape in counselor training are given by Berger and Gallant (1965); Poling (1965, 1968a, 1968b); Ryan (1969); Shiff and Reivich (1964); and Walz and Johnston (1963).

Uses of video tape in therapy have included studies by Geertsma and Reivich (1965) who conducted weekly therapy sessions with a client who was narcissistic and defensive. Significant results were demonstrated over a fourteen-week period with the patient who had received no relief from other types of therapy.

Alger and Hogan (1966a, 1966b, 1967) used video tape in conjoint family therapy. They reported favorable results from a clinical standpoint and their work has had much influence on the increased use of video tape particularly in the medical field.

Moore Chernell and West (1965), working with 80 psychiatric patients, found statistically significant differences in favor of a video feedback group over a control group. Forty patients in an experimental group received individual therapy in a structured interview. Immediately following the session the client and the therapist viewed the video tape in separate rooms with an interrogator who encouraged each to recall and explore behavior that occurred in the interview. Independent judges identified three categories of change as cured or maximally improved, moderately improved, and minimally improved or unchanged. The authors admitted it was not always possible to prevent the judges from knowing to which group, experimental or control, the patient belonged.

Further uses of video tape have been reported in articles that provide additional possibilities of research oriented study. Berger, Sherman, and Westlake (1968) used video tape in a mental health clinic setting. They observed that self-confrontation with video tape led to improved interpersonal group relationships. Groups appeared more cohesive and demonstrated a more caring attitude. Pascal, Cottrell and Baugh (1967) reported observed results in the use of video tape feedback with juvenile delinquents.

Stoller (1967a, 1967b, 1968a, 1968b) is one of the pioneers in developing the use of video tape feedback in groups. Stoller (1968a) stated that

> Focused feedback is a technique which has been developed for utilizing the video tape recorder within the group therapy situation, particularly in enhancing the presentation of information about self. The group provides the arena for behavior as well as the opportunity for reflection upon the impact on others of this behavior. Video tape is capable of extending such a process (p. 30).

He stated further, "Video tape represents an opportunity to present information in its clearest and most specific manner and therefore in its most useful form" (p. 36).

Stoller (1968a) suggests that video tape, like life itself presents more information than can be assimilated by a viewer. Selectivity, which is a constant feature of one's life, will take place and much information will be diluted and lose its intensity as a series of events are viewed. However, Stoller's technique of Focused Feedback enables careful and appropriate selectivity to take place.

> In effect, someone is saying, "Let us pay more attention to this; let us reflect upon it and wonder about its implications."... Thus, underscoring, rather than passive observation, is quite feasible with video tape equipment and represents an extension of one of the most important functions of therapy and counseling: guided reflection upon data about self which is normally overlooked or processed in only one of many possible ways (p. 33).

Summary of Literature Review

Underachievement is often a progressive experience beginning in the early elementary grades. For such students the gap between themselves and those who continue to achieve widens year by year. This experience leads to problems of self-concept and although many different attitudes have been identified by research, a general feeling of inadequacy, frustration and hostility is evident in the underachiever in high school and in college.

Counseling the underachiever in groups is one method of attempting to intervene to break the pattern that has been established. Lifton (1968) stated that, "Few will change their present functioning unless some agency intervenes and helps them take the time to assess their satisfaction with what it is, as contrasted with what could be" (p. 245). Groups provide an opportunity of sharing feelings and attitudes within a framework of a therapeutic atmosphere where "...the group counselees may utilize the group interaction to increase understanding and acceptance of values and goals and to learn and/or unlearn certain attitudes and behaviors" (Gazda et al., 1967, p. 306).

The use of video tape has been employed in a variety of experiences both in educational settings and therapeutic counseling. Most reports

are of a descriptive nature with little statistical support and research-oriented data provided. These studies have encouraged further exploration of the media and the possibilities that lie within the further development of techniques with video tape. A method of video tape feedback developed by Stoller (1967) called Focused Feedback has initiated a number of studies, many of which are still in process.

CHAPTER 2

INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE STUDY

Tennessee Self Concept Scale

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) consists of one hundred items designed to permit the subject to portray his own picture of himself. Each item is rated by the subject on a five-point scale from "completely false" to "completely true" as the subject relates that item to himself.

Fitts (1964) stated that "An individual's self-concept is a valid criterion of his state of mental health" (p. 5). In response to a need for an instrument to assess the self-concept, the development of the scale began in 1955. The test items were drawn from other self-concept measures including those developed by Balester (1956), Engel (1956), and Taylor (1953) and from written self-descriptions of patients and non-patients. Seven clinical psychologists judged the items and 90 that had unanimous agreement were selected. The score sheet is arranged in a two-dimentional, 3 x 5 scheme that classifies the 90 items. The remaining 10 items make up the Self Criticism Scale containing "mildly derogatory statements that most people admit as being true for them" (p. 2).

The TSCS is available in two forms: the Counseling Form and the Clinical and Research Form. Both forms use the same test booklet, but the Clinical and Research Form provides a greater scope of information, producing 29 variables on the profile sheet.

Reliability

Reliability data were reported by the test author (Fitts, 1965) on a test-retest procedure with 60 college students over a two-week period with coefficients ranging from .61 to .92. A shortened version of the scale was used by Congdon (1958) in a study with psychiatric patients. He obtained a reliability coefficient of .88 for the Total Positive score. Profile patterns maintained a remarkable similarity through repeated measures on the same individuals over long periods of time. Fitts reported that the distinctive features of individual profiles were still present for most persons a year or more later.

Validity

Four types of validation procedures are presented: (1) content validity,

(2) discrimination between groups, (3) correlation with other measures, and (4) personality changes under particular conditions (Fitts, 1965).

Content Validity

Seven clinical psychologists acted as judges in sorting the original pool of items. Only those items are included that received unanimous agreement from the judges.

Discrimination Between Groups

Data are presented showing discrimination between patient, non-patient groups, and persons characterized as high in personality integration (PI). The results show highly significant differences between the patient and non-patient groups--mostly at the .001 level on the scores used. It is also demonstrated that the (PI) group would show discrimination from the norm group in the direction opposite from the patients.

Correlation With Other Measures

The author stated an abundance of correlation data available. The TSCS profile variables and the MMPI scores of 102 psychiatric patients show correlations that might be expected with the exception of the Variability, Distribution and Conflict scores. In some instances these three scores show little linear correlation. On these three variables disturbed persons tend to show extreme scores in both directions (Fitts, 1965, p. 24).

The nature of the TSCS and the EPPS are such that few high linear correlations would be evident. Data from 66 high school students indicate little correlation between these two instruments.

Other measures with which correlation studies have been made include the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, Izard's Self Rating Positive Affect Scale, and the Kell-Hoefline Incomplete Sentence Blank measuring self-concept and family relations.

Personality Changes Under Particular Conditions

Several unpublished studies are reported in the TSCS manual (Fitts, 1965) using the Scale in a variety of settings. Additional studies have been reported by the author using the TSCS with delinquents (Fitts & Hamner, 1969), with teachers in sensitivity training, and with hospitalized mental patients (Fitts, Stewart, & Wagner, 1969). Indications are that the Scale can be used to measure changes in self-concept resulting from some significant experience.

Edwards Personal Preference Schedule

The EPPS contains 225 statements that are based on a list of needs as presented by H. A. Murray and others. The names of the 15 personality variables are those used by Murray (Edwards, 1959). The Schedule also has a measure of test consistency and profile stability built into the schedule. Each of the 15 variables is paired twice with each of the other variables. The test consistency is measured by the number of identical choices made by the subject each time the choice occurs. "Eleven or more identical choices may be taken as a significant departure from chance expentancy" (Edwards, 1959, p. 15).

Edwards claims that the factor of social desirability has been minimized in the EPPS. Statements of equal social desirability, but that measure different personality traits, are matched as far as possible. Also, means, standard deviations, and percentile norms are provided separately for men and women and for college students and adults.

Reliability

Internal consistency was established for each of the 15 variables using the Spearman-Brown formula. Split-half reliability coefficients ranging from .60 to .87 were obtained from the row and column score correlations of each variable over the 1509 subjects in the college norm group.

Test-retest reliability was established on 89 University students with a one-week test interval. The coefficients for the 15 variables ranged from .74 to .88.

Validity

Correlation of the EPPS has been established with various methods of self-rating such as ranking and Q sorts. However, such an approach can only establish an agreement between a particular subject and his scores on the inventory.

Correlation coefficients have also been established with other scales. The EPPS was given to 106 students and several weeks later these same students were administered the Guilford-Martin Personnel Inventory and the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale. The product-moment correlations for the 15 variables with these two scales are given in the manual (Edwards, 1959, p. 22). High scores on the TMAS indicate presence of anxiety and would be socially undesirable. The correlations of the TMAS and the EPPS ranged from -.22 on endurance to .22 on succorance. On the GMPI variable, high scores indicate the presence of the named traits. The three scales of the GMPI showed the following correlation ranges:

Cooperativeness: -.37 on aggression to .24 on endurance.
Agreeableness: -.51 on aggression to .33 on deference and abasement.
Objectivity: -.39 on succorance to .31 on endurance.

Social Desirability Factor

The factor of social desirability has been measured in a variety of ways to support the claim that it has been greatly reduced in the EPPS. The intra-class correlations between pairs of statements on the social desirability scale values is .85. It is admitted this is a variable affected by culture and group. The EPPS was designed primarily for a population of high school graduates with some college experience.

Two other measures were established. A list of 79 items from the MMPI that received perfect agreement as to a socially desirable response were used as a measure designated Socially Desirable (SD). This measure and the K scale of the MMPI were correlated with the EPPS variables. The correlations of the SD scale ranged from .09 to .32 and on the K scale from .01 to .33. "The generally low correlation coefficients...would seem to indicate that social desirability as measured by SD and K is not a major factor influencing scores on the EPPS variables"(EPPS Manual, 1959, p. 24).

Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes

The SSHA is a 100-item inventory designed

> (a) to identify students whose study habits and attitudes are different from those of students who earn high grades, (b) to aid in understanding students with academic difficulties, and (c) to provide a basis for helping such students improve their study habits and attitudes and thus more fully realize their best potentialities (Manual, p. 5).

The statements are marked on a five-point scale from "rarely" to "almost always" as the student decides how each item applies to himself. College Form C is the result of an eight-year program of research and is an outgrowth of the original SSHA developed in 1953. Four basic scales labeled Delay Avoidance (DA), Work Methods (WM), Teacher Approval (TA), and Education Acceptance (EA) are provided. In addition two sub-totals and a total score show a profile of the habits and attitudes toward study.

Reliability

Internal consistency was measured using the Kuder-Richardson Formula for estimating test reliability. A sample of 465 freshmen produced reliability coefficients ranging from .87 to .89. Two test-retest studies gave the following results. A four week interval with 144 freshmen resulted

in the following coefficients on the four subscales: DA .93, WM .91, TA .88, and EA .90. Based on 51 students retested over a fourteen-week interval the coefficients were .88, .86, .83, and .85.

Validity

The validity of the SSHA was established by computing correlation between the SSHA and GPA and between the SSHA and SAT for 1,772 entering freshmen in six colleges. Validation was done with a somewhat unreliable one semester GPA as the criterion. The manual provides tables of correlations for the six colleges using the GPA and SAT test scores. These tables show that the SSHA as a whole as well as three of the four sub-scores have a low correlation with the college aptitude test. The Work Methods (WM) scale had the highest correlation of .30. Weighted averages of the correlations with the aptitude test are given for the total score and each sub-score. These weighted averages are as follows: SSHA with aptitude test .21; DA .08; WM .30; TA .16 and EA .14. The correlations between the SSHA total score and the grade-point averages are significant and positive for all of the schools.

CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES

Subjects

The subjects for this study were drawn from the 1969 entering freshman class at Georgia Southwestern College. The College is a four-year institution and part of the University System of Georgia. The selected students were considered underachievers on the basis of their high school average and their SAT scores. (Only the verbal section of the SAT was considered because college standards of admission for women included only this section of the SAT.)

The entering freshman class had a mean verbal score of 390 and a high school average of 2.5. All students whose SAT verbal scores were above the class mean and whose HA was below 2.5 were considered. Initially 95 of the 548 freshman students were in the catagory described.

Letters were mailed to these students inviting them to participate in a program designed to aid them in their first quarter of college (see Appendix A). A brief statement indicating the student's interest in such a program was enclosed. The student was requested to sign and return it in the stamped, addressed envelope. Seventy-five students returned letters indicating interest.

During Freshman orientation week all the Ss to whom letters had been sent, whether or not they had returned the sheet indicating interest, were invited to a meeting where the program was outlined. At this meeting final opportunity to participate was extended. Of the 89 on campus, 80 agreed to meet during the Fall Quarter and of these 73 actually followed through in a group. Three males were veterans and the other students were high school graduates of the previous spring. None of the students was married. Seven were from states other than Georgia including Florida 1, New Jersey 2, New York 3, and Pennsylvania 1. Parent occupations are shown in Table 1. Sixty-two were dormitory residents and eleven commuted from home. The mean verbal SAT score for the sample was 467 and the high school average was 1.8.

By means of a table of random numbers the students were placed into four groups, one group being assigned as a control. Each of the three treatment groups was then divided into two sub-groups for the purpose of achieving optimum group size for counseling. Class schedules were a determining factor in selecting students insofar as each had to have an open period on the same day of the week. A final working arrangement included six sub-groups which met for ten weeks during the Fall Quarter.

The groups met once a week in sessions of one hour duration. A description of the four groups is given in Table 2.

TABLE 1

Occupations of Ss Parents

Occupation	N
Business Man	34
Laborer	13
Government	12
Farmer	3
Professionals	2
Chaplain	1
Chemist	1
Pilot	1
	67

Note.--4 Ss'parents deceased and 2 Ss'parents divorced.

TABLE 2

Description of Groups

Treatment	Number in Group	Total Males	Total Females
Group A IF	17	10	7
Group B DF	18	12	6
Group C NV	18	14	4
Group D Control	20	15	5
Total N	73	51	22

After the groups had been selected each student had a personal conference with the leader. During this session the purpose of the project was reviewed, time and place of the group meetings given, and the importance of consistent attendance was stressed. If the person was assigned to a group with video tape, the purpose and procedure was outlined and oppor-

tunity was given to choose not to be involved in the video tape group. There was none who chose not to be in the groups.

Group meetings were scheduled on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays. Notices were sent to group members through their post office boxes on the day prior to the scheduled meeting each week. The average attendance for each group for the ten scheduled sessions is shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3

Average Group Attendance

Treatment	Number of Sessions	Average Attendance
Group A IF	10	7.2
Group B DF	10	8.1
Group C NV	10	6.7

Treatment

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS), Edwards Personnel Preference Schedule (EPPS), and the Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes (SSHA) were administered to the students during the freshman orientation week. The SSHA was scored and the results were given to the students to be used in the early sessions for discussion purposes. The TSCS and the EPPS were administered as pre- and posttests. Each student at Georgia Southwestern College has an assigned post office box number; therefore these post office box numbers were used as "code" numbers on the instruments so that confidentiality could be maintained for the Ss.

Weekly group sessions were held in the informal atmosphere of an apartment living room. This room was located in a building formerly a dormitory, but now converted into classroom use.

The posttest session came at the time of the final examinations for the Fall Quarter. It was possible for several students to come to the office of the researcher to take the posttest if they missed it in the group meeting. The absence of some students at the posttest reduced the N available for pre- and posttest comparison on the TSCS and EPPS. Although some students did not appear for posttesting, they are included in other measures such as GPA and PFAG. The N's for the pre- and posttest on the EPPS and the TSCS are shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Group N's for Pre- and Posttests of TSCS and EPPS

Treatment		TSCS N	EPPS N
Group A	IF	13	12
Group B	DF	17	16
Group C	NV	15	12
Group D	Control	14	12

Procedure With Video Tape in the Group

The two groups for whom the additional experimental variable of video taping was employed had the procedure explained to them prior to the first group session. Two types of video feedback were employed designated as Immediate Feedback (IF) and Delayed Feedback (DF). In one group a particular behavior during the group session was replayed to the group for further exploration at that moment (IF). The feedback was done at the decision of the leader and/or the request of a member of the group. The replay occurred more than once if it appeared the group missed what was being said or seemed to misinterpret what was meant. In the DF group the entire group session was taped. Between sessions the leader viewed the tape and selected segments of the tape for replay at the following session. The next group session began with the viewing of the tape segment or segments selected.

One-half inch Sony equipment was used which included a camera with view finder and wide angle lens, recording deck and an 18" monitor for playback purposes. The initial session was used to acquaint the groups with the video procedures. The camera and playback was operated by the leader during the first four sessions. Beginning with session five one of the group was placed at the camera and a different group member was given this responsibility each succeeding week. The member at the camera was not excluded from the group discussion and at the same time this allowed the leader to move away from the camera and to concentrate completely on the group behavior. The camera was now more an accepted part of the group and not a focal point of concern.

The group sat in a closed circle with the leader beside the camera for the first four sessions. The camera was placed so that with only slight movements the needed camera adjustments necessary to cover the entire group could be made. This operation had been practiced, along with the other physical movements necessary in the operation of the video equipment, during a pilot study with a group during the previous summer quarter.

The recording deck was on a table at the leader's left with the 18" monitor. A minimum amount of time and distraction occurred in setting up the replay of the tape with the Immediate Feedback Group. After the fourth session when a student was placed at the camera, the leader still operated the playback phase of the procedure, but now was away from the camera. One microphone placed on a small raised surface in the center of the group picked up the voice recording.

Replay segments varied in length from two to five minutes, but in most cases were less than five minutes in length. The purpose of the replay was to focus on a specific behavior or response pattern and effort was made not to dilute this focus by a long playback. Video Feedback occurred at moments when a group member made responses centering in one of three basic areas of feeling:

A. Statements reflecting inner discrepant behavior (intra-personal).
B. Conflict of feelings expressed by at least two group members (inter-personal).
C. Reinforcement statements from one member to another group member (Supportive).

The number of playbacks depended entirely on the responses in the group and followed no consistent pattern. In every session following the initial session at least one playback occurred. In some instances an episode was played back more than once, either at the request of a group member or because the leader wanted to emphasize a particular behavior.

In the IF group it was natural to "break in" for short replays of the tape at any point in the discussion. Replays for the DF groups occurred as block segments at the start of each session. Certain feelings seemed to reoccur both during a session and from meeting to meeting. This became apparent as the tapes were reviewed between sessions.

Segments of tape were selected for replay, when possible, that contained the feelings expressed by one group member and also reflected group concerns as they had been made evident in brief responses prior to the selected tape segment. Segments were selected on a priority basis. That is, the segment judged by the leader as most appropriate for feedback was marked for use.

Table 5 and Table 6 describe the playback episodes used in the subgroups on video tape. It is apparent from Table 6 that group members expressed intra-personal discrepant feelings to a much greater extent than feelings of an inter-personal or supportive nature. Examples of each type of response are given in Appendix B.

Student Evaluation Questionnaire

The students were asked to complete an evaluation questionnaire at the end of the Fall Quarter. This was optional and the questionnaire was

not to be signed. The results were helpful in obtaining individual feelings about what occurred during the quarter. A summary table is given in Appendix C.

TABLE 5

Description of Video Feedback in Groups

Treatment	Number of Sessions Using Video	Total Number Playbacks	Average Time of Playbacks
Group A IF	8	25	2.9 min.
Group B DF	7	17	4.25 min.

TABLE 6

Types of Response in Video Feedback in Groups

Treatment	Response Content[1] Intraceptive	Interceptive	Supportive	Total
Group A IF	17	2	7	26
Group B DF	11	1	6	18

[1] In two instances the feedback carried both intra-personal discrepant and supportive responses; this accounts for the total differences in Table 5 and Table 6.

Analysis of the Data

Analysis of variance was computed on the difference between the Fall Quarter GPA and the Spring Quarter GPA. Analysis of variance was also computed on the difference between the PFAG and the Cumulative GPA for each group.

The TSCS and the EPPS were administered to each group as pre- and posttest measures. Analysis of covariance was computed on the posttest with the pretest as the covariate. Edwards (1960) was used as the reference for these analyses.

Duncan's Multiple Range Test was computed on the variables reaching

significance. This computation was based on Edwards (1960) and on Bruning & Kintz (1968) who stated

> The significance of the overall F means only that among the means of the four groups, at least two differ. The problem is to determine which specific groups actually differ significantly (p. 115).

The multiple range tests for each significant effect are summarized in pairs of tables. In the first table the range between the means, the comparison between groups, the product difference, the shortest significant range (SSR), and conclusions are reported. In the second table of the set, the means are ranked in order of decreasing magnitude and the significant and insignificant differences are indicated. Any two means which are not significant are underscored by the same line. Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The present study is an attempt to answer two general questions. Does group counseling with the added treatment variable of video tape feedback cause significant changes to occur in students so they will become more productive and more capable of fulfilling their potential than students who do not experience this treatment? Which of two selected treatments using video tape feedback is more effective?

The results relevant to each of the five hypotheses will be given. In each instance the measured variables will be considered in the following order: Grade Point Average, Tennessee Self Concept Scale, and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Information obtained from a student evaluation questionnaire is reported. Reasons for students' withdrawing from Georgia Southwestern College in the Winter and Spring Quarters are reported. The .05 level of significance was chosen as a basis for rejecting hypotheses for this study.

It was of interest to know what changes in GPA had occurred through the year following the counseling experience of the Fall Quarter. Two analyses of variance were computed for those students in the four groups who had remained in Georgia Southwestern College for the entire year.

Analysis of variance was computed on the difference between the Fall Quarter GPA and the Spring Quarter GPA. Analysis of variance was also computed on the difference between the cumulative GPA and the PFAG for the four groups. Results are shown in Tables 7 and 8.

Analysis of covariance was computed on the 29 variables of the TSCS. Tables 9 and 10 show the results of this analysis.

Although no significance was attained on the adjusted means for any of the variables, there were significant differences in the groups on the pre- and posttests for the Self Criticism Score. Duncan's Multiple Range Test was computed on these differences. The results are shown in Tables 11 through 14. Table 15 shows the pretest and posttest F values and the within-groups and between-means r's for the covariance analysis of the TSCS.

Analysis of covariance was computed on the 15 variables of the EPPS for the four groups. The results are shown in Tables 16 and 17. Significant differences found on pre- and posttest measures of the EPPS were

tested by Duncan's Multiple Range. The results are shown in Tables 18 through 21. Duncan's Multiple Range Test was then computed to determine which specific groups actually differed on the Adjusted Means. Results are shown in Table 22.

Student Evaluation Questionnaire

Item response distributions for the questionnaire are shown in Table 23. The questionnaire summary is shown in Appendix C.

Withdrawal From School

Twenty-three Ss withdrew from Georgia Southwestern College after the Fall Quarter. Tables 24 and 25 summarize the reasons for withdrawal in the Winter and Spring Quarters.

TABLE 7

Comparison of Fall and Spring Quarter GPA's Among Groups With Students Who Remained at Georgia Southwestern College All Year

Group	N	Fall GPA	Spring GPA	Change	F*
IF	12	2.10	2.14	+.04	
DF	9	1.87	1.84	-.03	
NV	13	2.20	2.00	-.20	
Control	16	2.05	2.01	-.04	.316

*No statistical significance obtained.

TABLE 8

Comparison of PFAG and Cumulative GPA's Among Groups With Students Who Remained at Georgia Southwestern College All Year

Group	N	PFAG	Cumulative GPA	Difference	F*
IF	12	2.16	2.16	----	
DF	9	2.12	1.83	-.29	
NV	13	2.10	2.08	-.02	
Control	16	2.09	2.03	-.06	.653

*No statistical significance obtained.

TABLE 9

Means, Standard Deviations and F Values
on the TSCS Pre- and Posttests

TSCS Scores		IF Pretest	IF Posttest (Adj)	DF Pretest	DF Posttest (Adj)	NV Pretest	NV Posttest (Adj)	Control Pretest	Control Posttest (Adj)	F*
Self Criticism	M	44.23	48.24	50.71	50.15	52.93	50.80	51.00	50.23	.768
	SD	5.93	6.09	7.43	8.29	6.68	6.26	5.67	4.57	
T/F	M	52.31	53.53	57.76	55.55	53.26	53.88	52.85	53.73	.536
	SD	10.49	10.89	15.37	18.10	10.08	9.97	15.19	13.40	
Net. Conf.	M	51.46	52.63	55.11	54.04	53.33	53.35	53.07	53.25	.606
	SD	8.99	8.96	12.58	12.23	9.74	7.13	10.47	10.46	
Tot. Conf.	M	52.38	52.14	52.11	52.04	55.20	53.22	48.07	50.49	.445
	SD	7.48	12.03	10.29	11.27	7.63	10.40	8.99	7.42	
Tot. P	M	45.92	43.80	42.41	43.37	41.26	43.22	45.00	43.69	1.006
	SD	8.91	10.76	9.72	9.03	10.07	10.87	13.62	13.51	
Row 1	M	46.61	44.88	42.41	44.13	43.26	44.28	46.42	44.88	.697
	SD	10.23	11.93	9.42	10.23	12.34	11.81	16.37	16.28	
Row 2	M	47.38	45.56	44.94	45.09	42.93	44.71	45.64	45.28	1.324
	SD	10.05	10.59	9.09	8.16	8.40	11.24	10.58	9.99	
Row 3	M	45.46	42.76	41.35	42.09	39.66	41.81	43.07	42.37	.508
	SD	8.97	10.48	10.52	9.95	12.26	12.64	13.87	13.20	

(Table continued on the next page)

TABLE 9 cont.

Means, Standard Deviations and F Values
on the TSCS Pre- and Posttests

TSCS Scores		IF Pretest	IF Posttest (Adj)	DF Pretest	DF Posttest (Adj)	NV Pretest	NV Posttest (Adj)	Control Pretest	Control Posttest (Adj)	F
Col. A	M	42.38	42.58	40.17	42.36	42.20	42.56	46.21	42.98	.794
	SD	12.39	14.06	8.83	7.15	10.67	10.08	16.49	14.71	
Col. B	M	47.76	43.94	40.71	41.82	39.33	41.41	42.35	42.32	.466
	SD	7.54	7.74	12.53	10.00	11.87	10.87	10.62	9.45	
Col. C	M	47.92	45.80	44.82	45.00	41.46	44.14	46.57	45.45	1.087
	SD	8.24	11.21	8.15	9.68	9.07	11.30	11.41	13.64	
Col. D	M	48.38	45.43	45.65	44.97	42.00	44.34	43.57	44.61	2.136
	SD	11.47	13.86	12.20	12.90	10.38	13.64	14.46	12.89	
Col. E	M	47.62	47.15	46.76	46.98	46.80	46.98	47.07	47.04	.809
	SD	8.94	8.95	10.54	9.24	10.71	11.45	14.68	13.17	
Tot V	M	50.61	50.90	48.35	50.02	53.40	51.96	52.35	51.58	.155
	SD	9.80	8.42	8.14	7.93	8.12	9.31	11.84	11.76	
Col. V	M	49.61	50.23	47.35	49.25	53.67	51.99	52.64	51.55	.479
	SD	12.95	9.94	10.04	9.42	9.26	11.32	10.79	9.83	
Row V	M	50.07	49.93	48.76	49.43	50.00	49.90	50.78	50.20	.220
	SD	8.58	10.73	8.91	7.88	10.11	10.19	12.03	13.98	

(Table continued on the next page)

TABLE 9 cont.

Means, Standard Deviations and F Values
on the TSCS Pre- and Posttests

TSCS Scores		IF Pretest	IF Posttest (Adj)	DF Pretest	DF Posttest (Adj)	NV Pretest	NV Posttest (Adj)	Control Pretest	Control Posttest (Adj)	F
Dist. D	M	45.92	45.25	42.29	44.78	45.93	45.25	47.07	45.40	.659
	SD	8.20	10.94	10.20	10.70	10.66	11.69	11.66	12.08	
5	M	46.69	47.40	44.88	46.99	49.40	48.01	49.86	48.11	.011
	SD	8.59	12.69	7.29	12.52	10.42	10.71	8.38	10.69	
4	M	50.07	50.16	54.17	51.71	47.80	49.30	48.14	49.43	.847
	SD	10.56	9.13	8.90	9.59	10.72	10.92	10.31	11.03	
3	M	55.00	55.66	58.05	56.36	55.80	55.84	54.07	55.45	.686
	SD	5.63	9.01	10.47	9.97	14.32	11.78	13.54	12.92	
2	M	49.46	48.73	48.76	48.49	46.93	47.83	48.28	48.32	.200
	SD	9.46	9.23	9.28	9.54	10.58	8.77	6.54	7.49	
1	M	47.23	45.16	41.41	44.39	45.67	44.95	45.92	44.98	.507
	SD	10.28	11.19	12.43	12.03	9.83	10.84	12.24	9.91	
DP	M	52.30	48.01	46.05	46.73	43.13	46.12	46.92	46.90	.869
	SD	6.54	9.02	9.05	9.01	8.90	6.14	10.72	10.19	
GM	M	53.62	56.75	58.82	57.47	60.07	57.64	55.71	57.04	1.421
	SD	10.31	11.68	8.98	8.02	10.20	12.08	16.74	14.31	

(Table continued on the next page)

TABLE 9 cont.

Means, Standard Deviations and F Values
on the TSCS Pre- and Posttests

TSCS Scores		IF Pretest	IF Posttest (Adj)	DF Pretest	DF Posttest (Adj)	NV Pretest	NV Posttest (Adj)	Control Pretest	Control Posttest (Adj)	F
Psy	M	58.00	56.00	55.00	54.93	53.00	54.22	53.93	54.55	.336
	SD	9.00	9.19	8.83	6.30	6.37	7.79	11.27	10.61	
PD	M	52.23	56.09	58.18	57.52	60.26	58.03	57.86	57.45	.398
	SD	7.13	7.44	10.07	8.58	9.84	8.54	9.98	9.04	
N	M	52.07	54.12	57.24	54.85	54.73	54.49	53.00	54.25	.683
	SD	10.36	11.16	9.19	10.81	8.89	9.71	13.18	13.25	
PI	M	46.62	46.31	47.18	46.59	42.13	43.99	48.07	47.06	.727
	SD	8.96	10.20	7.50	8.29	7.39	7.57	10.50	10.86	
NDS	M	56.38	59.31	61.76	60.51	62.73	60.73	58.93	59.88	.466
	SD	10.01	9.12	10.20	9.70	6.81	6.76	14.42	12.59	

*No statistical significance obtained.

TABLE 10

Error Mean Square and F Values for the Four Groups[1] on Pre- and Posttests for the 29 TSCS Variables

TSCS Scores	Pretest EMS	Pretest F	Posttest EMS	Posttest F
Self Criticism	42.705	4.556*	42.994	3.617*
T/F	173.100	.579	188.969	.801
Net Conf.	113.805	.294	99.844	.545
Tot. Conf.	76.948	1.610	109.071	.085
Tot. P.	114.436	.590	122.207	.248
Row 1	150.828	.457	159.679	.346
Row 2	90.548	.525	99.550	.190
Row 3	133.479	.642	134.655	.474
Col. A	149.460	.637	134.989	.234
Col. B	120.625	1.558	93.389	.761
Col. C	85.828	1.293	131.190	.541
Col. D	148.916	.711	177.052	.720
Col. E	129.881	.016	166.656	.324
Tot. V	90.178	.860	88.494	.716
Col. V	115.336	1.128	102.807	1.116
Row V	99.352	.111	115.809	.087
Dist. D	106.042	.651	128.737	.154
5	75.888	1.125	136.962	.598
4	101.773	1.357	104.137	2.133

(Table continued on the next page)

TABLE 10 cont.

Error Mean Square and F Values for the Four Groups on Pre- and Posttests for the 29 TSCS Variables

TSCS Scores	Pretest EMS	Pretest F	Posttest EMS	Posttest F
3	134.296	.339	121.413	.138
2	83.201	.196	77.951	.388
1	128.049	.783	122.550	.608
DP	80.516	2.504	75.564	1.794
GM	139.370	.874	133.979	.305
Psy	80.707	.794	72.044	.255
PD	88.753	1.815	71.401	1.357
N	109.180	.719	126.596	.133
PI	74.186	1.405	85.221	.237
NDS	113.127	1.030	94.625	.200

[1]The number of degrees of freedom for treatment is 3 and for error is 48. The SS for main effect may be obtained by multiplying F x df x EMS.

*Significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 11

Multiple Range Test: Self Criticism Variable on TSCS Pretest

Range	Group	Product Difference	SSR	Conclusion
4	NV - IF	8.70	5.16	Significant*
3	NV - DF	2.20	4.99	Not Significant
2	NV - Control	1.93	4.75	Not Significant
3	Control - IF	6.77	4.99	Significant*
2	Control - DF	.30	4.75	Not Significant
2	DF - IF	6.47	4.75	Significant*

*Significant at the .001 level.

TABLE 12

Results of Multiple Range Test: Self Criticism Variable on TSCS Pretest

Group	NV	Control	DF	IF
	N=15	N=14	N=17	N=13
Mean	52.93	51.00	50.70	44.23

TABLE 13

Multiple Range Test: Self Criticism Variable on TSCS Posttest

Range	Group	Product Difference	SSR	Conclusion
4	NV - IF	7.96	5.19	Significant*
3	NV - DF	4.04	5.02	Not Significant
2	NV - Control	2.30	4.78	Not Significant
3	Control - IF	5.66	5.02	Significant*
2	Control - DF	4.74	4.78	Not Significant
2	DF - IF	3.92	4.78	Not Significant

*Significant at the .001 level.

TABLE 14

Results of Multiple Range Test: Self Criticism Variable on TSCS Posttest

Group	NV	Control	DF	IF
	N=15	N=14	N=17	N=13
Means	54.80	52.50	50.76	46.84

TABLE 15

Pretest and Posttest F Values and Within-groups and Between Means r's for the 29 TSCS Variables

TSCS Scores	Pretest F	Posttest F	rxy Within Groups	$\overline{rxy}$
Self Criticism	4.556	3.617	.706	.955
T/F	.579	.801	.630	.815
Net Conf.	.294	.545	.613	.552
Tot. Conf.	1.610	.085	.616	.859
Tot. P.	.590	.248	.875	.683
Row 1	.457	.346	.822	.649
Row 2	.525	.190	.809	.122
Row 3	.642	.474	.835	.831
Col. A	.637	.234	.898	.848
Col. B	1.558	.761	.700	.840
Col. C	1.293	.541	.742	.601
Col. D	.711	.720	.829	.445
Col. E	.016	.324	.807	.414
Tot. V	.860	.716	.610	.975
Col. V	1.128	1.116	.565	.896
Row V	.111	.087	.620	.060
Dist. D	.651	.154	.870	.871
5	1.125	.598	.774	.998
4	1.357	2.133	.621	.988

(Table continued on next page)

TABLE 15 cont.

Pretest and Posttest F Values and Within-groups and Between Means r's for the 29 TSCS Variables

TSCS Scores	Pretest F	Posttest F	rxy Within Groups	$\overline{rxy}$
3	.339	.138	.773	.173
2	.196	.388	.644	.981
1	.783	.608	.868	.893
DP	2.504	1.794	.793	.904
GM	.874	.305	.861	.641
Psy	.794	.255	.643	.657
PD	1.815	1.357	.759	.936
N	.719	.133	.857	.889
PI	1.405	.237	.483	.048
NDS	1.030	.200	.776	.884

TABLE 16

Means, Standard Deviations and F Values
on the EPPS Pre- and Posttests

Variable		IF Pretest	IF Posttest (Adj)	DF Pretest	DF Posttest (Adj)	NV Pretest	NV Posttest (Adj)	Control Pretest	Control Posttest (Adj)	F
Achievement	M	14.91	14.54	14.25	14.23	15.08	14.62	12.66	13.51	1.728
	SD	1.73	2.96	2.59	4.24	3.75	4.38	3.03	4.42	
Deference	M	12.91	12.70	10.18	10.23	10.00	10.06	9.91	9.99	1.822
	SD	4.52	4.29	3.02	3.12	3.64	4.20	2.61	2.77	
Order	M	9.91	9.57	8.25	8.52	9.08	9.04	8.91	8.94	.485
	SD	5.99	6.24	4.19	3.86	4.78	4.16	3.09	5.08	
Exhibition	M	16.16	15.85	14.56	14.85	15.41	15.38	15.41	15.38	1.477
	SD	4.39	4.76	3.46	3.48	3.23	2.39	4.39	5.45	
Autonomy	M	13.50	13.65	13.37	13.57	15.25	14.75	13.75	13.81	.199
	SD	5.53	4.49	4.38	4.99	3.77	5.09	4.33	5.07	
Affiliation	M	15.33	15.56	16.06	16.05	16.16	16.12	16.58	16.40	1.279
	SD	5.28	5.43	3.38	4.26	4.41	3.23	3.34	4.00	
Intraception	M	17.16	15.68	15.25	14.71	11.08	12.59	12.75	13.44	4.585*
	SD	5.49	4.37	4.34	3.24	5.12	4.23	5.66	4.96	
Succorance	M	10.25	10.99	13.31	12.89	10.75	11.30	14.16	13.32	.482
	SD	4.49	4.34	5.21	6.47	4.27	2.39	5.36	4.97	

(Table continued on the next page)

TABLE 15 cont.

Means, Standard Deviations and F Values
on the EPPS Pre- and Posttests

Variable		IF		DF		NV		Control		F
		Pretest	Posttest (Adj)	Pretest	Posttest (Adj)	Pretest	Posttest (Adj)	Pretest	Posttest (Adj)	
Dominance	M	12.33	12.39	12.06	12.26	13.33	12.85	12.16	12.31	.207
	SD	6.08	5.66	5.42	5.34	4.14	4.60	4.47	4.83	
Abasement	M	15.91	16.26	17.31	16.92	17.33	16.93	15.50	16.06	.565
	SD	6.32	6.05	5.45	6.56	5.09	5.21	4.91	6.15	
Nurturance	M	14.16	14.97	16.93	16.64	15.83	15.97	17.58	17.03	.714
	SD	5.08	5.29	4.82	3.50	4.19	4.23	5.58	3.32	
Change	M	15.16	16.10	17.56	16.90	16.66	16.60	16.58	16.57	.605
	SD	4.99	5.22	4.19	4.69	4.19	4.48	4.23	2.83	
Endurance	M	13.08	12.42	11.31	11.56	10.25	11.04	12.75	12.26	1.640
	SD	5.18	5.12	5.61	5.19	4.99	3.18	5.64	5.23	
Heterosexuality	M	17.08	17.68	17.06	17.67	20.58	19.63	19.50	19.02	.151
	SD	6.50	6.89	5.68	6.31	6.59	5.98	5.93	6.49	
Aggression	M	12.50	12.49	12.50	12.49	13.16	13.03	11.75	11.89	2.085
	SD	5.39	6.43	4.46	3.71	4.75	4.73	4.20	3.26	
Consistency	M	10.75	10.93	12.25	12.11	11.66	11.65	11.58	11.59	.107
	SD	0.96	2.52	1.53	2.49	1.44	2.02	1.68	2.54	

*Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 17

Error Mean Square and F Values for the Four Groups[1] on Pre- and Posttests for the 15 EPPS Variables

Variable	Pretest		Posttest	
	EMS	F	EMS	F
Achievement	8.114	1.796	16.502	1.413
Deference	12.130	2.099	13.060	2.479
Order	21.119	.303	23.453	.431
Exhibition	14.988	.400	17.095	1.293
Autonomy	20.567	.460	24.250	.408
Affiliation	16.962	.191	18.496	1.445
Intraception	26.163	3.375*	17.391	7.169*
Succorance	23.866	1.914	24.391	1.066
Dominance	26.165	.164	26.446	.176
Abasement	29.875	.386	36.704	.153
Nurturance	24.358	1.134	16.892	1.389
Change	19.316	.681	19.568	.060
Endurance	28.976	.727	22.755	1.919
Heterosexuality	37.828	1.066	41.236	.455
Aggression	22.060	.182	21.354	2.299
Consistency Score	2.059	2.505	5.806	.185

[1]The number of degrees of freedom for treatment is 3 and for error is 48. The SS for main effect may be obtained by multiplying F x df x EMS.

*Significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 18

Multiple Range Test: Intraception Variable on EPPS Pretest

Range	Group	Product Difference	SSR	Conclusion
4	IF - NV	6.08	5.76	Significant*
3	IF - Control	4.41	5.59	Not Significant
2	IF - DF	1.91	5.31	Not Significant
3	DF - NV	4.17	5.59	Not Significant
2	DF - Control	2.50	5.31	Not Significant
2	Control - NV	1.67	5.31	Not Significant

*Significant at the .001 level.

TABLE 19

Results of Multiple Range Test: Intraception Variable on EPPS Pretest

Group	IF	DF	Control	NV
	N=13	N=17	N=14	N=15
Means	17.16	15.25	12.75	11.08

TABLE 20

Multiple Range Test: Intraception Variable on EPPS Posttest

Range	Group	Product Difference	SSR	Conclusion
4	DF - NV	7.00	3.84	Significant**
3	DF - Control	4.31	3.72	Significant*
2	DF - IF	1.73	3.54	Not Significant
3	IF - NV	5.25	3.72	Significant*
2	IF - Control	2.58	3.54	Not Significant
2	Control - NV	2.67	3.54	Not Significant

*Significant at .01 level.
**Significant at .001 level.

TABLE 21

Results of Multiple Range Test: Intraception Variable on EPPS Posttest

Group	DF	IF	Control	NV
	N=17	N=13	N=14	N=15
Means	17.56	15.83	13.25	10.58

TABLE 22

Multiple Range Test: Intraception Variable on EPPS Covariance

Range	Group	Product Difference	SSR	Conclusion
4	IF - NV	3.10	3.11	Not Significant
3	IF - Control	2.12	3.03	Not Significant
2	IF - DF	.85	2.88	Not Significant
3	DF - NV	2.24	3.03	Not Significant
2	DF - Control	1.27	2.88	Not Significant
2	Control - NV	.97	2.88	Not Significant

Results of Multiple Range Test: Intraception Variable on EPPS Covariance

Edwards (1960) referred to the Protection Level for the Duncan Multiple Range Test. With four means and alpha of .05 there is .86 probability of finding no erroneous significant differences between the four means, $(1 - .05)^{4 - 1} = .86$. Apparently if there is a true difference in the groups, it is between the IF and NV groups.

TABLE 23

Questionnaire Item Response Distribution[1]

Item	Percentage of Response				
	A	B	C	D	E
1.	43.2	37.8	13.5	2.7	2.7
	20.0	60.0	17.5	2.5	---
2.	36.0	39.3	9.0	---	15.1
3.	15.2	84.8	---	---	---
4.	38.2	26.4	8.8	2.9	23.5
5.	4.7	64.2	23.8	4.7	2.3

[1]See Appendix C for Student Evaluation Questionnaire.

TABLE 24

Reasons for Withdrawal From College

Reason	Winter Quarter	Spring Quarter	Total
Academic	5	5	10
Transfer	5	2	7
Work		2	2
Marriage		1	1
Injury	1		1
Dropout	2		2
	13	10	23

TABLE 25

Reasons for Withdrawal From College by Groups

Reason	Winter Quarter	Spring Quarter	Total
Academic			
IF	0	2	2
DF	2	3	5
NV	2	0	2
Control	1	0	1
Transfer			
IF	1	0	1
DF	1	2	3
NV	2	0	2
Control	1	0	1
Work			
DF	0	1	1
NV	0	1	1
Dropout			
Control	2	0	2
Injury			
IF	1	0	1
Marriage			
IF	0	1	1
	13	10	23

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The primary objective of this study was to determine whether the intervention of video tape feedback in group counseling with underachieving college freshmen would significantly affect the GPA and certain selected self-concept variables. A comparison of group means does not show significant difference between groups who experienced the effect of video tape feedback and those who received counseling without video tape or who received no counseling during the year. One exception is the Intraception variable of the EPPS which will be discussed. Although trends in favor of the counseled groups are generally indicated, the DF group attained less on the GPA measures than the other groups including the control. They also had the largest number of withdrawals from college. Comparison of the Fall Quarter and Spring Quarter GPA and Cumulative GPA in relation to the PFAG favored the IF group as shown in Tables 7 and 8. This differs from Winborn and Schmidt (1962) who found that the mean GPA of the control group was higher than the experimental group after counseling. They concluded that counseling had a negative effect on academic achievement.

Five null hypotheses were proposed. The following conclusions are based on the results obtained.

Null Hypothesis 1

There will be no significant differences in GPA and in measured self-concept variables between subjects who receive immediate video feedback and those who receive delayed video feedback.

The Self Criticism Variable on the pretest of the TSCS showed the IF and DF groups to be different as indicated in Table 11. However, at the time of the posttest this difference was not evident. The adjusted means showed non-significance. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 is <u>not</u> <u>rejected</u>.

Null Hypothesis 2

There will be no significant difference in GPA and in measured self-concept variables between subjects who are counseled in a setting with video tape feedback and those who are counseled in a setting with no video tape.

Significant differences were attained on the Intraception variable of the EPPS and the Self Criticism variable of the TSCS. Duncan's Multiple Range Test was computed on the pre- and posttests means as well as on the adjusted means.

EPPS Intraception Variable

Pretest significant differences were found between the If and NV groups using Duncan's Multiple Range Test. The posttest showed group differences between the DF and NV as well as the IF and NV groups. However, on the adjusted means the difference is questionable. The Protection Level Factor for Duncan's Multiple Range Test as described by Edwards (1960) seems to affect the outcome on this measure. Reference to this is made below Table 22.

TSCS Self Criticism Variable

The pre- and posttests revealed significant differences between the NV and IF groups on this variable. The pretest measured differences did not change as a result of treatment and changes that may have occurred among groups were not such that caused them to alter positions with one another. Consequently, no significant differences were evident on the adjusted means and Hypothesis 2 is <u>not</u> <u>rejected</u>.

Null Hypothesis 3

> There will be no significant difference in GPA and in measured self-concept variables between subjects who are counseled with immediate video feedback and those who receive no counseling.

Significant differences were found in the Self Criticism variable of the TSCS for the IF and Control groups on both the pretest and posttest measures. Comparison of the adjusted means did not reveal any significance. Any changes that occurred kept the groups in the same relationship to one another as they were at the pretest. Hypothesis 3 is <u>not</u> <u>rejected</u>.

Null Hypothesis 4

> There will be no significant differences in GPA and in measured self-concept variables between subjects who are counseled with delayed video feedback and those who receive no counseling.

The posttest of the EPPS showed significant differences between the DF and Control groups on the Intraception variable. No significance was evident when the adjusted means were compared. Hypothesis 4 is <u>not</u> <u>rejected</u>.

Null Hypothesis 5

> There will be no significant difference in GPA and in measured self-concept variables between subjects who receive group counseling without video tape and those who receive no counseling.

No significant differences were found in these comparisons. Hypothesis 5 is not rejected.

Student response on the evaluation forms indicated that impressions given immediately following an extended group counseling experience are generally favorable. Eighty per cent indicated that it was fairly easy or very easy to discuss personal feelings and concerns. Eighty per cent also felt that the discussions were of some help or very helpful.

Of those exposed to the video tape camera, 36.3% felt little or no self-consciousness from the beginning. Those who felt self-conscious at first said they felt comfortable by the end of the second session. Three students said it tended to bother them and 15% or 5 students expressed no opinion. Sixty-four per cent felt that the video feedback was either very helpful or of some help with 23.5% expressing no opinion.

It is likely that several who checked "no opinion" on the video tape statements were students who had not been exposed to the video tape. If this is true, the percentage of those who indicated favorable reaction to the video tape experience would be much greater. For example, eliminating the "no opinion" checks under T. V. Camera Playback would increase the percentage from 64.6% to 84.6% for those who found it of some help or very helpful.

Although a large percentage of the Ss indicated that the video tape feedback was a helpful experience, little indicated change is shown in the objective results. It may be as Fitts and Stewart (1969) concluded

> The simple fact that individuals have been exposed to something (like video tape feedback) does not guarantee that they have become truly involved in it, or that it has had much meaning to them or impact upon them (p. 18).

Where space was provided for comments regarding weaknesses of the program in the student evaluation questionnaire, the feeling that nothing had been forced on a person was expressed. The meetings were voluntary and the discussions were conducted with little structure provided. Brown (1969) differentiated between high and low-anxious college underachievers. He found that with low-anxious Ss open discussion served to involve them in the kind of thinking they wished to avoid. As a result their anxiety increased and evidently their academic progress was also impeded.

The Ss for this study were not classified as to anxiety level. However, they showed preference for a structured type of discussion.

Two instruments were given to the Ss as pre- and posttest measures. The TSCS as described is designed to measure 29 self-concept variables and the EPPS measures 15 personality variables while minimizing the social desirability factor that may otherwise influence responses.

The results of the EPPS showed a significant F on the Intraception variable. The other 14 variables produced non-significant differences.

The evidence seems to indicate that the IF group decreased in its intraception. This may indicate several factors working. It suggests a possibility of defensiveness building up in the group. It may also indicate internal struggles that caused less willingness to "face facts." Davis (1969) stated that it was not until the 18th session in group counseling with 7th- and 9th-grade boys that evidence of positive change began to show. His evaluation along with Fitts (1970) indicated longer duration of counseling in terms of weeks and months is necessary for self-concept change to be evident.

The F values for the pre- and posttest and the within-groups and between-means r's are reported for the TSCS in Table 15. These results demonstrate that the groups changed. Group change occurred in such a way, however, that the relative position of the groups remained approximately the same. In almost every instance there was some convergence among the groups on the posttest. There was also evidence of change occurring in individuals in such a way as to negate group changes. Some individuals were moving in a positive direction while others were moving in a negative direction so that the group difference was cancelled out.

Gazda and Larsen(1968) in a review of 104 group counseling studies stated

> One of the more serious problems in need of resolution of outcome research in group counseling is that of defining experimental variables that are common to each group participant. Frequently when data are grouped, gains made by certain Ss are canceled out by other Ss who, to show positive change, may need to and perhaps actually do change in the opposite direction on a given variable (p. 65).

This pattern of change is supported by Fitts (1969) in a study with a sensitivity group experience involving teachers. He stated

> There are marked individual differences in the changes which occur. Thus traditional group measures usually reflect little significant directional change for total groups. Individuals are changing in opposite directions and these changes tend to cancel each other out (p.6).

He stated further, "Thus it becomes important that future research on sensitivity training, psychotherapy, etc., study individuals rather than groups" (p. 6). Appendix D shows sample profile sheets of two individuals from each group demonstrating this directional change tending to cancel out group changes.

Appendix E shows the profile of each group on the TSCS pre- and posttests. The picture of generally undesirable self-concept in the profiles may indicate reasons for underachievement. The use of covariance in analyzing the group pre- and posttests adjusts for the initial self-concept differences. It may be that changes that occur are dependent on the kinds of self-concepts that are brought to the groups. Fitts (1969) stated in summary of a study with teachers that, "The kind of self-concept changes which occurred were in part a function of the kinds of self-concepts which the Ss initially brought to the experience" (p. 61). A visual study of the group profiles on the TSCS show some trends within the groups.

Group A (IF)

The positive scores are below the mean except in Col. C on the posttest score. The group was not consistent in the pre- and posttest pattern. The profiles overlap one another with generally lower positive scores on the posttest. There is an increase in the NDS and an increase of 3 responses with a consequent lowering of 1 and 5 responses in the distribution scores. These changes indicate less confidence in how the self-concept was viewed by this group in the posttest. Change may have begun to occur within the group, but as pointed out elsewhere in this study, time caught up and counseling terminated too soon.

Group B (DF)

The picture is a generally depressed pattern of scores with very little change between the pre- and posttests indicated.

Group C (NV)

This profile is similar to that of Group A both on the pre- and posttests. There appears to have been some changes occurring, or beginning to be evident. Some dissatisfaction with the self-concept brought to the group is evident. However, directional change in individuals tends to minimize the group change. Fitts (1969) in a study of teacher self-concept changes stated, "The kinds of self-concept changes which occurred were in part a function of the kinds of experience" (p. 61).

Group D (Control)

The profile of the pre- and posttest parallel each other. The directional changes are generally undesirable in the posttest.

All four groups present self-concept profiles that are somewhat deviant and undesirable. In personal correspondence Fitts stated, "This would certainly suggest that their self-concepts may help to explain their underachievement and in this sense the initial self-concept profiles which they present are exactly what one would expect."

Implications for Further Research

Efforts to intervene in the problem of the underachiever have been conducted by several researchers. The present study using video tape feedback is exploratory in nature and has attempted to provide additional needed information. Several possibilities for further study are evident from the results.

1. Time seems to be a key factor in change of the self-concept. It is suggested that any replication of the study include a longer period of time in terms of weeks for counseling. It is also recommended that more frequent meetings be held for the groups.

2. The time period between taping and viewing for the delay feedback may be shortened and separated from the counseling sessions themselves. Let the group experience of viewing the tape occur within a day or two of the actual counseling session.

3. Another approach to the use of delay feedback may be done on an individual basis. This would remove the variable of self-confrontation with other group members present.

The possibilities of video tape feedback as an effective aid in the group counseling experience continues to need exploration. Group members generally accept and welcome the experience of confronting themselves and exploring their behavior. At what point and how often should it be employed? Stoller (1969), a recognized authority in group procedures with video tape feedback, wrote in a personal communication that, "time within the group is probably the single most important variable. The most effective video tape feedback will coincide with the group development." If this is so, the effective use of video tape feedback hinges on a variable difficult to measure. The unanswered questions and the variety of opportunities for use of video tape feedback provide fertile ground for further research into the possibilities of this aid to counseling.

REFERENCES

References

Alger, I., & Hogan, P. The impact of videotape recordings on involvement in group therapy. Journal of Psychoanalysis in Groups, 1966, 2, 50-56. (a)

Alger, I., & Hogan, P. Videotape: Its use and significance in psychotherapy. Paper presented before the Society of Medical Psychoanalysts at the New York Academy of Medicine, New York, September, 1966. (b)

Alger, I., & Hogan, P. The use of videotape recordings in conjoint marital therapy. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1967, 123, 1425-1430.

Anderson, A. R. Group counseling. In G. V. Glass(Ed.), Review of Educational Research, American Educational Research Association, Washington, D. C., 1969, 39, (2), 209-226.

Bachman, J. G. Prediction of academic achievement using the Edwards need achievement scale. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1963, Microfilm 16-19.

Barrett, H. O. An intensive study of 32 gifted children. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1957, 36, 192-194.

Baymur, R., Feriha, J., & Patterson, C. H. Three methods of assisting underachieving high school students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7, 83-89.

Bednar, R. L., & Weinberg, S. L. Ingredients of successful treatment programs for underachievers. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 1-7.

Berger, M. M. (Ed.) Videotape techniques in psychiatric training and treatment. New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1970.

Berger, M. M., & Gallant, D. M. The use of closed-circuit television in the teaching of group psychotherapy. Psychometrics, 1965, 6, 16-18.

Berger, M. M., Sherman, B., Spalding, J., & Westlake, R. The use of video tape with psychotherapy groups in a community mental health service program. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1968, 18, (4), 504-515.

Bonney, W. C., & Foley, J. The transition stage in group counseling in terms of congruence theory. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1963, 10, 136-138.

Brown, R. D. High- and low anxious college underachievers. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, (3), 209-214.

Brown, W. F., & Holtzman, W. H. Manual, Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1967.

Bruning, J. L., & Kintz, B. L. Computational handbook of statistics. Scott, Foresman and Company, 1968.

Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, C. J. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1963.

Combs, C. F. Perception of self and scholastic underachievement in the academically capable. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1964, September, 43, 47-51.

Czajkoski, E. H. The use of video tape recordings to facilitate the group therapy process. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1968, 18, 516-524.

Danet, B. N. Self-confrontation by video tape in group psychotherapy. Dissertation Abstracts, 1968, 28, 3058-B.

vis, C. S. An assessment of the effectiveness of small group counseling on selected groups of seventh and ninth grade underachieving boys. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1969.

Dickenson, W. A., & Truax, C. B. Group counseling with college underachievers. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 45, 243-247.

Drake, L. E. MMPI patterns predictive of underachievement, Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 164-167.

Drasgow, J. Underachievers. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1957, 4, 210-211.

Dreikurs, R., & Sonstegard, M. The Adlerian or teloanalytic group counseling approach. In G. M. Gazda (Ed.), Basic approaches to group psychotherapy and group counseling, Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1968, pp. 197-232.

Edwards, A. L. Manual, Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1959.

Edwards, A. L. Experimental design in psychological research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.

Fitts, W. H. Personal communication. April 17, 1970.

Fitts, W. H. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale: Ten years of research in mental health. Mind Over Matter No. 4, Tennessee Department of Mental Health, December, 1964.

Fitts, W. H. Manual, Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Nashville, Tennessee: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.

Fitts, W. H., & Hamner, W. T. The self concept and delinquency research monograph No. 1. Nashville Mental Health Center, Nashville, Tennessee, July, 1969.

Fitts, W. H., Stewart, O. C., & Wagner, M. K. Three studies of self concept change. Research Bulletin No. 6, Nashville Mental Health Center, Nashville, Tennessee, November, 1969.

Frankel, E. A comparitive study of achieving and under-achieving high school boys of high intellectual ability. Journal of Educational Research, 1960, 53, 172-180.

Gazda, G. M. A functional approach to group counseling. In G. M. Gazda (Ed.), Basic approaches to group psychotherapy and group counseling. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1968, pp. 263-303. (a)

Gazda, G. M. Group psychotherapy: Its definitions and history in G. M. Gazda (Ed.), Innovations to group psychotherapy, Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1968, pp. 3-14. (b)

Gazda, G. M., Duncan, J. A., & Meadows, M. E. Group counseling and group procedures-report of a survey. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1966-67, 6, 305-310.

Gazda, G. M., & Larsen, J. L. A comprehensive appraisal of group and multiple counseling research. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1968, 1, 57-66.

Gebhart, G. G., & Hoyt, D. P. Personality needs of under- and overachieving freshmen. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1958, 42, (3), 178-181.

Geertsma, R. H., & Reivich, R. S. Repetitive self-observation by video tape playback. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 1965, 141, 29-41.

Gerberich, R. Factors related to the college achievement of high aptitude students who fail expectation and low-aptitude students who exceed expectation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1941, 32, 253-265.

Gilbreath, S. H. Group Counseling dependence and college male under-achievement. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 449-453.

Glasser, W. Reality therapy. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Glasser, W. Schools without failure. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Gowan, J. C. The underachieving gifted child--A problem for everyone. Journal of Exceptional Children, 1955, 21, 247-249.

Hafner, L. E. Improving grade point average through reading-study skills instruction. In G. B. Shick and M. M. May (Eds.), New frontier in college-adult reading, Fifteenth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference, 1966, pp. 46-54.

Hafner, L. E. What materials should be used in college reading courses? In J. Allen Figure 1 (Ed.), Forging ahead in reading, International Reading Association Conference Proceedings, 1967, pp. 145-147.

Hart, J. T. The evolution of client-centered psychotherapy. Paper supported by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Washington, D. C., 1960.

Hart, U. H. A study of the effects of two types of group experience on the academic achievement of college underachievers. Dissertation Abstracts, 1964, 25, (2), 1003-1004.

Hill, W. Personality traits and reading disability: A critique. In E. P. Bliesmer and R. C. Staiger (Eds.), Problems, programs, and projects in college-adult reading, Eleventh Yearbook of the National Reading Conference, 1962, pp. 174-179.

Hobbs, N. Sources of gain in psychotherapy. American Psychologists, 1962, 17, 741-747.

Holland, J. L. The prediction of college grades from personality and aptitude variables. The Journal of Educational Psychology, 1960, 51, (5), 245-255.

Hosford, R. E., & Briskin, A. S. Changes through counseling. In G. V. Glass (Ed.), Review of Educational Research, American Educational Research Association, Washington, D. C., 1969, 39, (2), 189-207.

Hummel, R., & Sprinthall, N. Underachievement related to interests, attitudes and values, Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, December, 44, 388-395.

Jackson, R. M. In support of the concept of underachievement. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1968, 47; 56-61.

Kagan, N., Krathwohl, D. R., & Miller, R. Stimulated recall in therapy using video tape- a case study. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 1963, 10, 237-243.

Kagan, N., Krathwohl, D. R., & others. Studies in human interaction: Interpersonal process recall stimulated by video tape. Office of Education, Bureau of Research, Final Report, 1967.

Kemp, C. G. Behavior in group guidance (socio process) and group counseling (psyche process), Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1963, 10, 373-377.

Kemp, C. G. Perspectives on the group process. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964.

Kirk, B. Test versus academic performance in malfunctioning students, Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1952, 16, 213-216.

Korn, H. A. Higher Education programs and student development. In G. V. Glass (Ed.), Review of Educational Research, American Research Association, Washington, D. C., 1969, 39, (2), 155-171.

Krech, D., & Crutchfield, R. S. Theory and problems of social psychology, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1948.

Krug, R. E. Over- and underachievement and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1959, 43, (2), 133-137.

Landsman, T., & Lane, D. AV media, yes; depersonalization, no. Audio Visual Instruction, 1963, 8, 24-28.

Lifton, W. Group-centered counseling. In G. M. Gazda (Ed.), Basic approaches to group psychotherapy and group counseling. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1968, pp. 233-262.

London, P. The modes and morals of psychotherapy. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964.

Luchins, A. S. Group therapy a guide. New York: Random House, 1967.

Lum, M. K. M. A comparison of under- and overachieving female college students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1960, 51, (3), 109-113.

Malloy, J. Over- and underachievement among female college freshmen. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1954, 1, (4), 260-263.

Martin, R. D. Videotape self-confrontation in human relations training, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Alberta University, 1969.

Marx, G. L. A comparison of the effectiveness of two methods of counseling of academic underachievers. Dissertation Abstracts, 1959, 20, (5), 2144.

MacLennan, B. W., & Felsenfeld, N. Group counseling and psychotherapy with adolescents. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.

McDonald, A. S., Zolick, E. S., & Bryne, J. A. Starting and improving college reading programs. In O. S. Causey and W. Eller (Eds.), Reading Deficiencies and Personality Factors: A Comprehensive Treatment, Eighth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference, 1959, pp. 89-98.

Moore, F. J., Chernell, E., & West, M. J. Television as a therapeutic tool. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1965, 12, 217-220.

Moreno, J. L., & Kipper, D. A. Group psychodrama and community-centered counseling. In G. M. Gazda (Ed.), Basic approaches to group psychotherapy and group counseling. Springfield, Illinois, Charles C. Thomas, 1968, pp. 27-79.

Mowrer, O. H. The new group therapy. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1964.

Ohlsen, M. M. Counseling within a group setting. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 1960, 23, 104-109.

Pascal, G. R., Cottrell, T. B., & Baugh, J. R. A methodological note on the use of video tape in group psychotherapy with juvenile delinquents. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1967, 17, 248-251.

Patterson, C. H. Phenomenological psychology. Paper read at the American Personnel and Guidance Association National Convention, Chicago, April, 1962.

Patterson, C. H. Behavior therapy and relationship therapy: A reconciliation. Paper read at Illinois Psychological Association, October, 1965.

Patterson, C. H. Theories of counseling and psychotherapy. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

Poling, E. G. Video tape recordings in counseling practicum. AV Communication Review, 1965, 13, 462. (Abstract)

Poling, E. G. Video tape recordings in counseling practicum: I--Environmental considerations. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1968, 7, 348-356. (a)

Poling, E. G. Video tape recordings in counseling practicum: II--Critique considerations. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1968, 33-38. (b)

Raygor, A. L. College reading improvement and personality change. Journal of Counseling Psychology, Fall 1959, 6, 211-217.

Roth, R. M., Mauksch, H. O., & Peiser, K. The non-achievement syndrome, group therapy and achievement change. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1967, 46, 393-398.

Ryan, C. W. Video aids in practicum supervision. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1969, 8, 125-129.

Seeman, J. Personality Integration in College Women. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, (1), 91-93.

Serwer, B.,& Levy, E. Group psychotherapy as part of a college-level study skills program. International journal of group psychotherapy, 1966, 16, 65-77.

Shaw, M. C., & Grubb, J. Hostility and able high school underachievers, Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1958, 5, 263-266.

Shaw, M. C., & McCuen, J. T. The onset of academic underachievement in bright children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1960, 103-108.

Shaw, M. C., & Wurston, R. W. Research on group procedures in school. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 44, 27-34.

Shiff, B., & Reivick, R. The use of television as an aid to psychotherapy supervision. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1964, 10, 84-88.

Spielberger, C. D., Weitz, H., & Denny, J. P. Group counseling and the academic performance of anxious college freshmen. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 195-204.

Spielberger, C. D., & Weitz H. Improving the academic performance of anxious college freshmen: A group counseling approach to the prevention of underachievement. Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, 1964, 78, (13, Whole No. 590).

Stefflre, B. Theories of counseling. New York: McGraw Hill, 1965.

Stoller, F. H. Group psychotherapy on television: An innovation with hospitalized patients. American Psychologists, 1967, 22, 158-162. (a)

Stoller, F. H. Therapeutic concepts reconsidered in the light of video tape experience. Paper presented at the Western Psychological Association meeting, San Francisco, California, May 1967. (b)

Stoller, F. H. Focused feedback with video tape: Extending the group's functions. In G. M. Gazda (Ed.), Innovations to group psychotherapy, Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1968, pp. 207-256. (a)

Stoller, F. H. Use of video tape (focused feedback) in group counseling and group therapy. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1968, 1, (2), 30-43. (b)

71

Stoller, F. H. Personal communication. February 25, 1969.

Trow, W. C. Group processes. In C. W. Harris (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Third Edition, the MacMillan Co., New York, 1960, American Educational Research Association, 602-612.

Underwood, B. J. Psychological research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957.

Urlinger, C. A., & Stephens, M. W. Relation of achievement motivation of academic achievement in students of superior ability. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1960, 51, 259-266.

Walz, G. R., & Johnston, J. A. Counselors look at themselves on video tape. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1963, 10, 232-236.

Wellington, C. B., & Wellington, J. The underachiever challenges the guidelines. Chicago: Rand & McNalley, 1965.

Winborn, B., & Schmidt, L. G. The effectiveness of short-term group counseling upon the academic achievement of potentially superior but underachieving college freshmen. Journal of Educational Research, 1962, 55, 169-173.

Wofford, J. C., & Willoughby, T. L. Attitudes and scholastic behavior, Journal of Educational Research, 1968, 61, 361.

Wolf, A. Psychoanalysis in groups. In G. M. Gazda (Ed.), Basic approaches to group psychotherapy and group counseling. Sprinfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1968, 80-108.

Wright, E. W. Multiple counseling: why? when? how?. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1969, 27, 551-557.

APPENDIX A

Georgia Southwestern College

Americus, Georgia 31709

Dear Freshman,

I know you have received letters of information and letters of welcome- and perhaps other communications since you first indicated an interest in attending Georgia Southwestern. You know we are interested in you and want to be of any assistance we can to make your academic experience a success in every way.

You have not heard from me before, but I am writing to tell you that you have been selected from the freshman class to take part in a new program at GSC. This is a program designed to increase one's general study ability and adjustment to college. It is not an orientation program for freshmen- this you have had and will receive on your arrival to campus. This program is a "first" at GSC.

Your taking part will be of much benefit to you and I feel will assist future students as you help in the development of this idea. The program will involve small groups of students meeting from one to two hours per week with me. We will introduce it to you in detail after you arrive on campus in September.

My purpose in writing to you at this time is to help in the plans for the fall. This program will be one quarter in length terminating at Christmas. We want to have materials and other needed plans made so we can start with no delay in the fall. You will find a self addressed, stamped envelope enclosed and a slip of paper to return. If you will take part in this planned program all you need to do is sign the paper and return it. Let me stress that this in no way "binds" you to it. If after you come you decide against it that will be your privilege. Of course, I hope you do take advantage of this opportunity provided. There will be no outside preparation or assignment- this is not to add to your college work load; rather to assist in whatever you plan to study here.

I look forward to your returned envelope and then to the opportunity of meeting and working with you this fall. You will receive information during registration concerning our meeting time, etc.

See you in September!

Sincerely,

Warren J. Valine
Counselor

74

WJV/pjb

Enclosures - 2

I would like to take part in the new program planned for a selected group of freshmen students during the fall quarter of 1969 at Georgia Southwestern College.

Signed _____

I understand this is not binding and I can change my mind after arriving on campus if I so decide.

SIGN AND RETURN IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED. THANK YOU.

Georgia Southwestern College

Americus, Georgia 31709

January 13, 1970

Dear

In checking our winter enrollment I note that you did not return to Georgia Southwestern. We are interested in our students and former students. I would appreciate if you would take a moment to check any of the statements below that apply to your situation. It will help us know why some students decide not to return to Georgia Southwestern.

Just slip this back into the envelope provided and drop it in the mail - it already has a stamp. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Warren J. Valine
Counselor

Please check the appropriate spaces.

1.____ Transfer to another college. Which one? _____

2.____ Unable to return because of illness.

3.____ Military obligation.

4.____ Decided (or needed) to get a full time job.

5.____ Had academic difficulty and unable to return this quarter.

6.____ I plan to continue my college education at a later date.

7. Other explanation or comment:

76

APPENDIX B

Intra-personal Discrepancy

Example 1:

A: Like today we started a new chapter. He (math professor) said something and he started moving on and I started to raise my hand and say, "I'm sorry I just don't understand. Will you please go a little slower---but I just didn't do it..." (Drifts off at the end).

Leader: You just couldn't say it.

A: No. I wanted to so bad; I wanted to say, "Will you please cool it," but I thought--like--I would show up to be the 'dumb bunny' in the whole class. That's the way I always am.

J: Why don't you talk to him a bit after class if you don't want to in class.

A: Yeah, I can say, "I'm a--"

J: If he knows you don't understand, maybe he'll take more time.

W: I talked with the teacher about algebra. It seemed to help--not a formal conference, but after class.

Leader: A., how about this idea?

A: Well, I don't know. I'm always scared to--to talk with the teacher. I did talk with my biology teacher 'cause we were going to have a test and he said he always wants to hear our questions and everything so maybe I'm coming out of it. But I feel if I don't get it, I should just sit back and try to get it later on instead of bothering them.

Example 2:

S: It's been kind of a shock to me because I usually...can sit down and talk to my folks and ... now all of a sudden I, uh, seem to have become somebody different...and...no longer the little (girl) they knew back home.

Leader: You're somebody different--in their eyes-- or feel like you're someone different?

S: I feel like I've grown up a lot, and I feel like in their eyes too that I'm somebody different. I'm still S., but I'm also--- different (carefully stated). I'm a little bit more mature.

Leader: Um hm.

S: And it's all of a sudden come up and, uh, I don't quite understand it. This is what bothers me. If I understood it more, then I would know how to handle the situation.

Leader: You feel a great inability to know how to handle the sudden change that has come up for you since leaving home.

S: Un huh.

Leader: This getting them to see how you feel--to put it into words--is this one thing that's concerning you? You're not quite sure how in the world I'm going to get them to see...(interrupted).

S: Yeah

Leader: ...what I really feel.

S: Yeah, to see that I'm really sincere in what I say. Usually it's "Oh yeah, sure," and they--they may say they understand--but I don't really feel that they do. And I too want to understand what they're feeling.

Inter-personal Discrepancy

Example 1:

D: I think the reason a lot of students don't go to the teacher and ask for help--'cause I know it's happened to me--is sometimes the teacher looks down on you and acts like--you little dummy, you didn't get it so I'm not going to help you.

F: Some will think you're tryin' to 'brown nose' them.

D: Sometimes.

R: I think it depends a lot on what the teacher is like--whether you like her and you're willing to go to her or not.

S: I don't see it that way at all.

Leader: How do you see it?

S: Well, if I don't get something in class--and this happens frequently--the way the professor states it or something like this and it just doesn't dawn on me just right or I have a question, I don't think twice about going up right after class and asking him. It's only natural that you're going to miss a few things, so it's to your advantage to pick 'em up. And, uh, if he does think you're a little dumb it's usually because you are. That's why you're there so you won't be when you get out.

Leader: You assume he's there...(interrupted).

S: My conception of a teacher is like--I just feel if you really want to help yourself, they'll want to help you out too.

Leader: What do you think of that F.?

F: I don't agree with him. I just don't. I just don't look at it like that. I mean, he's right. I agree with him about them being human, but I just like to get it by myself and if I can't do it by myself I just won't do it.

Supportive

Example 1:

S: After supper I decided I would try to sleep a couple of hours, then, get up and study...it was bad because my roommate all of a sudden...I was, uh, I heard this scream in my room. I came up out of sleep you know and these people were in there laughing and screaming and cutting up...it was really bad when all of a sudden you're trying to sleep and you hear a scream.

G: I think that's about the biggest problem I've encountered so far at college about how just...to make the adjustment...consideration of other people and things like that.

Example 2:

C: I like living in the dorm. I can set my own schedule of study and what not.

P: I agree with that. At home I'd have all kinds of household chores to do. Here I can study without all that hanging over me.

APPENDIX C

Student Evaluation Questionnaire

1. I find talking about personal feelings and concerns with other students as we have done this quarter:

A	Very easy	A	Very helpful
B	Fairly easy	B	Of some help
C	Fairly difficult	C	Little help
D	Very difficult	D	No help at all
E	No opinion		

2. The TV camera:

A Did not bother me at all
B Made me self-conscious at first but I got over it
C Tended to bother me
D Made me self-conscious all the time
E No opinion

3. (If you checked the second item, please indicate which session you felt no self-consciousness.)

A During the first session
B During the second session
C During the third session
D Other explanation

4. The TV camera playback:

A Was very helpful in the group discussion
B Was of some help in the group discussion
C Was of little help in the group discussion
D Was of no help in the group discussion
E No opinion

5. The group discussions had an effect on my study habits so that I feel:

A I have generally much better study habits as a result
B I have improved in some areas as a result
C There has been little improvement in my study habits
D There has been no improvement in my study habits
E No opinion

APPENDIX D

© WILLIAM H. FITTS 1964

COUNSELOR RECORDINGS AND TESTS
BOX 6184 ACKLEN STA
NASH[illegible] TENN.

E _____ SCHOOL GRADE _____ SEX M F _____ AGE _____ DATE _____ TOTAL TIME _____

T SCORE	SELF CRITICISM	T/F	CONFLICT NET	CONFLICT TOTAL	TOTAL	POSITIVE SCORES ROW 1	ROW 2	ROW 3	COLUMN A	COLUMN B	COLUMN C	COLUMN D	COLUMN E	PERCENTILE SCORES	VARIABILITY TOTAL	VARIABILITY COL. TOT.	VARIABILITY ROW TOT.	DISTRIBUTION D	5	4	3	2	1	EMPIRICAL SCALES DP	GM	PSY	PD	N	PI	NDS	T SCORE
90														99.99																	
80	50													99.9																	
70																															
60														99																	
50	45													95																	
40														90																	
30														80																	
20														70																	
10														60																	
0														50																	
														40																	
														30																	
														20																	
														10																	
														5																	
														1																	

PROFILE HITS UP 16 7 28 44 14 11
DOWN 29 9 24 17 9 24

34 19 24 34 14 29 14 22 8 19
24 28 18 39 17 34 21 17 14 15

Pretest _____

Posttest -------

Figure 1. Individual Profile Immediate Feedback

Tennessee Self Concept Scale

© WILLIAM H. FITTS 1964

PROFILE SHEET

Clinical and Research Form
PUBLISHED BY:
COUNSELOR RECORDINGS AND TESTS
BOX 6184 ACKLEN STA.
NASHVILLE, TENN. 37212

NAME | SCHOOL GRADE | SEX M F | AGE | DATE | TOTAL TIME

T SCORE | SELF CRITICISM | T/F | CONFLICT: NET, TOTAL | TOTAL | POSITIVE SCORES: ROW 1 2 3, COLUMN A B C D E | PERCENTILE SCORES | VARIABILITY: TOTAL, COL. TOT., ROW TOT. | DISTRIBUTION: D 5 4 3 2 1 | EMPIRICAL SCALES: DP GM PSY PD N PI | NDS | T SCORE

Pretest _____

Posttest ------

Figure 2. Individual Profile
Immediate Feedback

Tennessee Self Concept Scale

PROFILE SHEET

Clinical and Research Form

[redacted] ILLIAM [redacted] 1964

PUBLISHED BY:
[redacted] R REC[redacted] AND T[redacted]
[redacted] 4 ACKLEN BLVD.
NASHVILLE, TENN. 37212

NAME

SCHOOL GRADE | SEX M F | AGE | DATE | TOTAL TIME

T SCORE	SELF CRITICISM	T/F	CONFLICT NET	CONFLICT TOTAL	TOTAL	POSITIVE SCORES ROW 1	ROW 2	ROW 3	COLUMN A	COLUMN B	COLUMN C	COLUMN D	COLUMN E	PERCENTILE SCORES	VARIABILITY TOTAL	VARIABILITY COL TOT.	VARIABILITY ROW TOT.	DISTRIBUTION D	5	4	3	2	1	EMPIRICAL SCALES DP	GM	PSY	PD	N	PI	NDS	T SCORE
90		3.00												99.99																	90
	50	2.75	80	80	450	150		150	90	90	90	90	90					200	65	60	75	55	60						25	80	
		2.50	70																											75	
		2.25	60	70	440		150			90								195	60	55	70	50	55	95	55	80	30	65	30	70	
80		2.00		60	430		145	145			85			99.9	110	70	45	190	55	50	65	45	50	90	60	75	35	40		65	80
		1.90	50	55			140								105	65	40	185	50	45	55	40	45	85	65	70	40	45		60	
		1.80	40		420										100	60			45		50									55	
		1.70	30											99	90	55	35	180		45		40	45	80	70	65	45	50	20	40	
70		1.60		50	410	145	135	140					85		85			175	40		45									35	70
		1.50	20		400		130		85	85		85			80	50		170		40		35	40	75	75	60	50	55		30	
	65	1.40		45				135			80			95	75			165	35		40									25	
60		1.30	15		390	140	125		80	80		80	80		70	45	30	160		40		35	35	70	80	55	60	65	15	20	
			10	40	380		120	130			75			90	65	40		155	30	35	30									15	60
		1.20	5			135	115		80	75		80	75		60	35	25	150				30	30	65	85	50	70	75		10	
	40		0	35	370			125			70			80	55			145	25	30	25									5	
		1.10			360		110		75	75		75	70		50	30	20	140				25		60	90	45	75	80		0	
50			-5	30	350	130	105	120			75			70	45			135	20	25	20		25	55						-5	
	35	1.00							70	70		70	65		40	25	15	130				20		50	100	45	85	85		10	
			-10		340		100				70			60	35			125	15	20	15		20	45						-10	
	30	.90		25		125		115	65	65		65	60		30	20	10	120				15			105	40	80	90		15	
			-15		330		95				65			50	25			115	10	15	10		15	40						-15	
40		.80				120		110	60	60		60	55		20	15	5	110				10			110	35	75	95		20	
			-20	20	320		90				60			40	15			105	5	10	5		10	35						-20	
	25	.70				115		105	55	55		55	50		10	10	0	100				5			115	30	70	100		25	
			-25		310		85				55			30	5			95	0	5	0		5	30						-25	
30		.60		15		110		100	50	50		50	45		0	5		90				0			120	25	65	105		30	
			-30		300		80				50			20				85		0			0	25						-30	
	20	.50				105		95	45	45		45	40			0		80							125	20	60	110		35	
			-35	10	290		75				45			10				75						20						-35	
	15	.40				100		90	40	40		40	35					70							130	15	55	115		40	
			-40		280		70				40			5				65						15						-40	
20		.30		5		95		85	35	35		35	30					60							135	10	50	120		45	
			-45		270		65				35			1				55						10						-45	
	10	.20				90		80	30	30		30	25					50							140	5	45	125		50	
			-50	0	260		60				30							45						5						-50	
	5	.10				85		75	25	25		25	20					40							145	0	40	130		55	
			-55		250		55				25							35						0						-55	
10		.00				80		70	20	20		20	15					30							150		35	135		60	
			-60		240		50				20							25												-60	
		-.10				75		65	15	15		15	10					20									30	140		65	
			-65		230		45				15							15												-65	
		-.20				70		60	10	10		10	5					10									25	145		70	
			-70		220		40				10							5												-70	
		-.30				65		55	5	5		5	0					0									20	150		75	
			-75		210		35				5																			-75	
		-.40				60		50	0	0		0															15	155		80	
			-80		200		30				0																			-80	
		-.50				55		45																			10	160		85	
			-85		190		25																							-85	
		-.60				50		40																			5	165		90	
			-90		180		20																							-90	
		-.70				45		35																			0	170		95	
			-95		170		15																							-95	
		-.80				40		30																				175		100	
			-100		160		10																							-100	
		-.90				35		25																				180		105	
			-105		150		5																							-105	
		-1.00				30		20																				185		110	
			-110		140		0																							-110	
		-1.10				25		15																				190		115	
			-115		130		-5																							-115	
		-1.20				20		10																				195		120	
			-120		120		-10																							-120	
		-1.30				15		5																				200		125	
			-125		110		-15																							-125	
		-1.40				10		0																							
			-130		100		-20																								
		-1.50				5		-5																							
			-135		90		-25																								
		-1.60				0		-10																							
			-140		80		-30																								
		-1.70				-5		-15																							
			-145		70		-35																								
		-1.80				-10		-20																							
			-150		60		-40																								
		-1.90				-15		-25																							
			-155		50		-45																								
		-2.00				-20		-30																							
			-160		40		-50																								
		-2.25				-25		-35																							
			-165		30		-55																								
		-2.50				-30		-40																							
			-170		20		-60																								
		-2.75				-35		-45																							
			-175		10		-65																								
		-3.00				-40		-50																							
			-180		0		-70																								

PROFILE LIMITS UP 16 7 29 44 14 11
DOWN 29 9 24 17 9 24

34 19 24 34 14 29 14 22 9 19
24 29 18 39 17 34 21 17 14 15

Pretest _____

Posttest -----

Figure 3. Individual Profile
Delayed Feedback

Tennessee Self Concept Scale

© WILLIAM H. FITTS 1964

PROFILE SHEET

Clinical and Research Form
PUBLISHED BY:
COUNSELOR RECORDINGS AND TESTS
BOX 6104 ACKLEN STA.
NASHVILLE, TENN. 37212

NAME | SCHOOL GRADE | SEX M F | AGE | DATE | TOTAL TIME

T SCORE	SELF CRITICISM	T/F	CONFLICT NET	CONFLICT TOTAL	TOTAL	POSITIVE SCORES ROW 1	ROW 2	ROW 3	COLUMN A	COLUMN B	COLUMN C	COLUMN D	COLUMN E
90	50	3.00 / 2.75 / 2.50 / 2.25	80 / 70 / 60	80 / 70	450 / 440	150		150	90	90	90	90	90
80		2.00	50 / 40	60 / 55	430 / 420		150 / 145	145			85		
70		1.90 / 1.80 / 1.70 / 1.60	30	50	410	145	140 / 135	140			80	85	85
60	45	1.50 / 1.40 / 1.30	20 / 15 / 10	45 / 40	400 / 390 / 380	140	130 / 125 / 120	135 / 130 / 125	85	85	75	85 / 80	80 / 75
50		1.20 / 1.10 / 1.00	5 / 0	35 / 30	370 / 360 / 350	135	120 / 115 / 110	120 / 115	80	80	75 / 70	80 / 75	75 / 70
40	35	.90 / .80 / .70	-10 / -15 / -20	25 / 20	340 / 330 / 320	125	105 / 100	110 / 105	75	75	70 / 65	70 / 65	70 / 65
30	25	.60	-25 / -30	15 / 10	310 / 300 / 290	120	95 / 90	100 / 95	70	70	60 / 55	60 / 55	65 / 60
20	15	.50 / .40 / .30	-35 / -40	5 / 0	280 / 270 / 260 / 250	115 / 110	85 / 80	90 / 85	65	65	50	50	60 / 55
10		.20 / .10	-50 / -60	-5 / -10	240 / 230 / 220 / 210 / 200	105 / 100 / 95	75 / 70 / 65	80 / 75 / 70	60	60	45	45	50
					190 / 180 / 170 / 160	90 / 85	60 / 55	65 / 60	55	55	40	40	45

PERCENTILE SCORES	VARIABILITY TOTAL	VARIABILITY COL. TOT.	VARIABILITY ROW TOT.	DISTRIBUTION D	5	4	3	2	1
99.99				200 / 195	65 / 60	60 / 55	75 / 70 / 65	55 / 50	60 / 55
99.9	110	70 / 65	45	190 / 185	55 / 50 / 45	50 / 45	60 / 55 / 50	45 / 40	50 / 45
99	105 / 100 / 95 / 90	60 / 55	40 / 35	180 / 175 / 170	40	40	45 / 40	40 / 35	45 / 40
95	85 / 80 / 75	50 / 45	30	165 / 160	35	35	35 / 30	30	35 / 30
90	70 / 65	40	25	155 / 150	30	35	30	30	30
80	60 / 55	35		145 / 140	25	30	25	25	30 / 25
70	50	30	20	135 / 130	20	25	20	20	25 / 20
60	45	25	15	125 / 120	15	20	15	15	20 / 15
50	40	20	10	115 / 110	10	15	10	10	15 / 10
40	35	15	5	105 / 100 / 95	5	10	5	5	10 / 5
30	30	10	0	90 / 85 / 80 / 75	0	5	0	0	5 / 0
20	25	5		70 / 65	-5	0	-5	-5	0 / -5
10	20	0	-5	60 / 55	-10	-5	-10	-10	-5 / -10
5	15	-5	-10	50	-15	-10	-15	-15	-15
1	10	-10	-15	45 / 40	-20	-15	-20	-20	-20

EMPIRICAL SCALES DP	GM	PSY	PD	N	PI	NDS	T SCORE
95	50 / 55	80	30	30 / 35	25	80 / 75 / 70	90
90	60	75 / 70	35	40		65 / 60 / 55	80
85	65 / 70	65	40	45 / 50	20	50 / 45	
80	75	60	50	55		40 / 35	70
75	80	55	55	60 / 65		30 / 25	
70	85	50	60	70	15	20 / 15	60
65	90	45	65	75		10	
60	95	40	70	80	10	5	50
55	100	35	75	85		0	
50	105	30	80	90	5	-5	40
45	110	25	85	95		-10	
40	115	20	90	100	0	-15	30
35	120	15	95	105		-20	
30	125	10	100	110		-25	20
25	130	5	105	115		-30	
20	135	0	110	120		-35	10
15	140	-5	115	125		-40	
10	145	-10	120	130		-45	
5	150	-15	125	135		-50	
0	155	-20	130	140		-55	

PROFILE LIMITS UP 16 7 29 44 14 11 1 34 19 24 34 14 29 14 22 9 19
DOWN 29 9 24 17 9 24 24 28 18 39 17 34 21 17 14 15

Pretest _____

Posttest ------

Figure 4. Individual Profile
Delayed Feedback

Tennessee Self Concept Scale

© WILLIAM H. FITTS 1964

PROFILE SHEET

Clinical and Research Form

PUBLISHED BY:
COUNSELOR RECORDINGS AND TESTS
BOX 6184 ACKLEN STA.
NASHVILLE, TENN. 37212

NAME | SCHOOL GRADE | SEX M F | AGE | DATE | TOTAL TIME

T SCORE | SELF CRITICISM | T/F | CONFLICT: NET, TOTAL | TOTAL | POSITIVE SCORES: ROW 1 2 3; COLUMN A B C D E | PERCENTILE SCORES | VARIABILITY: TOTAL, COL. TOT., ROW TOT. | DISTRIBUTION: D 5 4 3 2 1 | EMPIRICAL SCALES: DP GM PSY PD N PI | NDS | T SCORE

PERCENTILE SCORES: 99.99, 99.9, 99, 95, 90, 80, 70, 60, 50, 40, 30, 20, 10, 5, 1

PROFILE LIMITS

	T SCORE	SELF CRITICISM	T/F	CONFLICT NET	CONFLICT TOTAL	TOTAL	ROW 1	ROW 2	ROW 3	COL A	COL B	COL C	COL D	COL E	VARIABILITY TOTAL	VARIABILITY COL. TOT.	VARIABILITY ROW TOT.	D	5	4	3	2	1	DP	GM	PSY	PD	N	PI	NDS	T SCORE
UP	16	7	29	44	14	11																									
DOWN	29	9	24	17	9	24																									

Pretest _____

Posttest -------

Figure 5. Individual Profile
Non Video

Tennessee Self Concept Scale

© WILLIAM H. FITTS 1964

PROFILE SHEET

Clinical and Research Form
PUBLISHED BY:
COUNSELOR RECORDINGS AND TESTS
BOX 6184 ACKLEN STA.
NASHVILLE, TENN. 37212

NAME | SCHOOL GRADE | SEX M F | AGE | DATE | TOTAL TIME

T SCORE | SELF CRITICISM | T/F | CONFLICT: NET, TOTAL | TOTAL | POSITIVE SCORES: ROW 1, 2, 3; COLUMN A, B, C, D, E | PERCENTILE SCORES | VARIABILITY: TOTAL, COL. TOT., ROW TOT. | DISTRIBUTION: D, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 | EMPIRICAL SCALES: DP, GM, PSY, PD, N, PI | NDS | T SCORE

PERCENTILE SCORES: 99.99, 99.9, 99, 95, 90, 80, 70, 60, 50, 40, 30, 20, 10, 5, 1

PROFILE LIMITS: UP 16 7 29 44 14 11 5 — IN 29 2 24 34 19 24 34 14 29 14 22 9 19 — 34 19 29

Pretest _____

Posttest ------

Figure 6. Individual Profile
Non Video

Tennessee Self Concept Scale

PROFILE SHEET

Clinical and Research Form

© WILLIAM H. FITTS 1964

PUBLISHED BY [redacted]
BOX 5184 ACKLEN S A
NASHVILLE, TENN 37212

NAME | SCHOOL GRADE | SEX M F | AGE | DATE | TOTAL TIME

T SCORE | SELF CRITICISM | T/F | CONFLICT: NET, TOTAL | TOTAL | POSITIVE SCORES: ROW 1 2 3, COLUMN A B C D E | PERCENTILE SCORES | VARIABILITY: TOTAL, COL. TOT., ROW TOT. | DISTRIBUTION: D 5 4 3 2 1 | EMPIRICAL SCALES: DP GM PSY PD N PI | NDS | T SCORE

99.99
99.9
99
95
90
80
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
5
1

91

Pretest _____

Posttest ------

Figure 7. Individual Profile Control

PROFILE LIMITS UP 16 7 29 44 14 11
DOWN 29 9 24 17 9 24
34 19 24 34 14 29 14 22 9 18
24 29 18 39 17 34 21 17 14 15

Tennessee Self Concept Scale

© WILLIAM H. FITTS 1964

PROFILE SHEET

Clinical and Research Form
PUBLISHED BY:
COUNSELOR RECORDINGS AND TESTS
BOX 6184 ACKLEN STA.
NASHVILLE, TENN. 37212

NAME | SCHOOL GRADE | SEX M F | AGE | DATE | TOTAL TIME

T SCORE | SELF CRITICISM | T/F | CONFLICT: NET, TOTAL | TOTAL | POSITIVE SCORES: ROW 1 2 3, COLUMN A B C D E | PERCENTILE SCORES | VARIABILITY: TOTAL, COL. TOT., ROW TOT. | DISTRIBUTION: D 5 4 3 2 1 | EMPIRICAL SCALES: DP GM PSY PD N PI | NDS | T SCORE

99.99
99.9
99
95
90
80
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
5
1

92

Pretest _____

Posttest ---------

Figure 8. Individual Profile Control

PROFILE LIMITS UP 16 7 29 44 14 11 34 19 24 34 14 29 14 22 9 19
DOWN 29 9 40 17 0 34 24 29 18 30 17 24 21 17 14 19

APPENDIX E

Tennessee Self Concept Scale

© WILLIAM H. FITTS 1964

PROFILE SHEET

Clinical and Research Form
PUBLISHED BY:
COUNSELOR RECORDINGS AND TESTS
BOX 6184 ACKLEN STA.
NASHVILLE, TENN. 37212

NAME | SCHOOL GRADE | SEX M F | AGE | DATE | TOTAL TIME

T SCORE | SELF CRITICISM | T/F | CONFLICT: NET, TOTAL | TOTAL | POSITIVE SCORES: ROW 1 2 3; COLUMN A B C D E | PERCENTILE SCORES | VARIABILITY: TOTAL, COL. TOT., ROW TOT. | DISTRIBUTION: D 5 4 3 2 1 | EMPIRICAL SCALES: DP GM PSY PD N PI | NDS | T SCORE

99.99
99.9
99
95
90
80
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
5
1

Pretest _____

Posttest --------

Figure 9. Group Mean
Immediate Feedback

Tennessee Self Concept Scale — PROFILE SHEET — Clinical and Research Form

© WILLIAM H. FITTS 1964

PUBLISHED BY [illegible] CO. [illegible] NO TE[illegible]
BOX 6184 ACKLEN STA.
NASHVILLE, TENN. 37212

NAME | SCHOOL GRADE | SEX M F | AGE | DATE | TOTAL TIME

T SCORE	SELF CRITICISM	T/F	CONFLICT NET	CONFLICT TOTAL	TOTAL	POSITIVE SCORES ROW 1	ROW 2	ROW 3	COLUMN A	COLUMN B	COLUMN C	COLUMN D	COLUMN E	PERCENTILE SCORES	VARIABILITY TOTAL	VAR. COL. TOT.	VAR. ROW TOT.	DISTRIBUTION D	5	4	3	2	1	EMPIRICAL SCALES DP	GM	PSY	PD	N	PI	NDS	T SCORE
90		3.00	80	80	450	150		150	90		90	90	90	99.99				200	65	60	75	55	60						25	80	
	50	2.75																						95	50	80		30		75	90
		2.50	70															195												70	
		2.25	60	70			150			90				99.9	110	70	45		60	55	70	50	55					30			
80					440		145				85					65		190			65		50	90	60	75		35	40		65
		2.00		60											105				55			45					40			60
		1.90	50		430		140								100	60	40	185		50	60			85	65					55	
		1.80	40	55											95				45			40			70			50		50	80
		1.70			420			135						99	90			180		45	55		50							45	
70			30												85	55	35		50		50							20			
		1.60		50	410	145		140			80		85		80			175		45		40	45	80	75	60	50		55	40	
		1.50	20				130		85	85		85			75	50		170	40		45									35	70
		1.40		45	400			135						95			30	165		40		35	40		80			60		30	
60	45		15				125				75		80		70	45		160	35		40			75				65		25	
		1.30		40	390	140		130	85	80		80						155		40		30	35		85	55					
		1.20	10		380		120		80		75		80	90	65	40	25	150	30		35			70			60	70	15		60
			5			135		125		80		80						145		30		25	30		90	55				20	
50	40				370		115		80		70		75	80	60	35		140	25		30			65			65	75			
		1.10	0	35						75		75					20	135		25		25	25		95					10	
	35	1.00			360	130	110	120	75		70		70	70	55	30		130	20		20			60			75				
		.90	-10		350		105			70		70					20	125		20		20	25		100		45			5	
	30			25		125		115	70		65		65	60	50	30		120	15		15			55							
		.80	-15		340		100			65		65					15	115		20		15	20		105		40			10	
40				20		120		110			60		60	50	45	25		110	10		15			50							
	25	.70	-20		330		95		65	60		60					10	105		15		10	15		110		85			15	
				15		115		105			55		55	40	40	20		100	5		10			45							
	20	.60	-25		320		90		60	55		55					5	95		10		5	10		115		80			20	
				10		110		100			50		50	30	35	15		90	0		5			40							
30			-30		310		85		55	50		50					0	85		5		0	5		120		75			25	
	15	.50		5		105		95			45		45	20	30	10		80	-5		0			35							
		.40	-35		300		80		50	45		45					-5	75		0		-5	0		125		70			30	
				0		100		90			40		40	10	25	5		70	-10		-5			30							
		.30	-40		290		75		45	40		40					-10	65		-5		-10	-5		130		65			35	
20				-5		95		85			35		35	0	20	0		60	-15		-10			25							
		.20	-50		280		70		40	35		35					-15	55		-10		-15	-10		135		60			40	
				-10		90		80			30		30	-5	15	-5		50	-20		-15			20							
		.10	-60		270		65		35	30		30					-20	45		-15		-20	-15		140		55			45	
10				-15		85		75			25		25	-10	10	-10		40	-25		-20			15							
				-20	260		60		30	25		25					-25	35		-20		-25	-20		145		50			50	
				-25	250	80	55	70	25	20	20	20	20	-15	5	-15	-30	30	-30	-25	-30	-30	-25	10	150	45	55	0	5	55	
				-30	240		50		20	15		15					-35	25		-30		-35	-30		155		60			60	
				-35	230	75	45	65	15	10	15	10	15	-20	0	-20	-40	20	-35	-35	-35	-40	-35	5	160	40	65	-5	0	65	
				-40	220		40		10	5		5					-45	15		-40		-45	-40		165		70			70	
				-45	210	70	35	60	5	0	10	0	10	-25	-5	-25	-50	10	-45	-45	-45	-50	-45	0	170	35	75	-10	-5	75	
				-50	200		30		0	-5		-5					-55	5		-50		-55	-50		175		80			80	
				-55	190	65	25	55	-5	-10	5	-10	5	-30	-10	-30	-60	0	-55	-55	-55	-60	-55	-5	180	30	85	-15	-10	85	
				-60	180		20		-10	-15		-15					-65	-5		-60		-65	-60		185		90			90	
				-65	170	60	15	50	-15	-20	0	-20	0	-35	-15	-35	-70	-10	-65	-65	-65	-70	-65	-10	190	25	95	-20	-15	95	
				-70	160		10		-20	-25		-25					-75	-15		-70		-75	-70		195		100			100	
				-75	150	55	5	45	-25	-30	-5	-30	-5	-40	-20	-40	-80	-20	-75	-75	-75	-80	-75	-15	200	20	105	-25	-20	105	
				-80			0		-30	-35		-35					-85	-25		-80		-85	-80				110			110	
				-85		50	-5	40	-35	-40	-10	-40	-10	-45	-25	-45	-90	-30	-85	-85	-85	-90	-85	-20		15	115	-30	-25	115	
				-90			-10		-40	-45		-45					-95	-35		-90		-95	-90				120			120	
				-95		45	-15	35	-45	-50	-15	-50	-15	-50	-30	-50	-100	-40	-95	-95	-95	-100	-95	-25		10	125	-35	-30	125	
				-100			-20		-50	-55		-55					-105	-45		-100		-105	-100				130			130	
				-105		40	-25	30	-55	-60	-20	-60	-20	-55	-35	-55	-110	-50	-105	-105	-105	-110	-105	-30		5	135	-40	-35	135	
				-110			-30		-60	-65		-65					-115	-55		-110		-115	-110				140			140	
				-115		35	-35	25	-65	-70	-25	-70	-25	-60	-40	-60	-120	-60	-115	-115	-115	-120	-115	-35		0	145	-45	-40	145	
				-120			-40		-70	-75		-75					-125	-65		-120		-125	-120				150			150	
				-125		30	-45	20	-75	-80	-30	-80	-30	-65	-45	-65	-130	-70	-125	-125	-125	-130	-125	-40		-5	155	-50	-45	155	
				-130			-50		-80	-85		-85					-135	-75		-130		-135	-130				160			160	
				-135		25	-55	15	-85	-90	-35	-90	-35	-70	-50	-70	-140	-80	-135	-135	-135	-140	-135	-45		-10	165	-55	-50	165	
				-140			-60		-90	-95		-95					-145	-85		-140		-145	-140				170			170	
				-145		20	-65	10	-95	-100	-40	-100	-40	-75	-55	-75	-150	-90	-145	-145	-145	-150	-145	-50		-15	175	-60	-55	175	
				-150			-70		-100	-105		-105					-155	-95		-150		-155	-150				180			180	
				-155		15	-75	5	-105	-110	-45	-110	-45	-80	-60	-80	-160	-100	-155	-155	-155	-160	-155	-55		-20	185	-65	-60	185	
				-160			-80		-110	-115		-115					-165	-105		-160		-165	-160				190			190	
				-165		10	-85	0	-115	-120	-50	-120	-50	-85	-65	-85	-170	-110	-165	-165	-165	-170	-165	-60		-25	195	-70	-65	195	
				-170			-90		-120	-125		-125					-175	-115		-170		-175	-170				200			200	
				-175		5	-95	-5	-125	-130	-55	-130	-55	-90	-70	-90	-180	-120	-175	-175	-175	-180	-175	-65		-30		-75	-70		
				-180			-100		-130	-135		-135					-185	-125		-180		-185	-180								
				-185		0	-105	-10	-135	-140	-60	-140	-60	-95	-75	-95	-190	-130	-185	-185	-185	-190	-185	-70		-35		-80	-75		
				-190			-110		-140	-145		-145					-195	-135		-190		-195	-190								
				-195		-5	-115	-15	-145	-150	-65	-150	-65	-100	-80	-100	-200	-140	-195	-195	-195	-200	-195	-75		-40		-85	-80		
				-200			-120		-150	-155		-155						-145		-200			-200								

PROFILE LIMITS UP 16 7 29 44 14 11 34 19 24 34 14 29 14 22 9 19
DOWN 25 8 24 17 9 24 24 29 18 39 17 34 21 17 14 15

Pretest _____

Posttest -------

Figure 10. Group Mean
Delayed Feedback

Tennessee Self Concept Scale

© WILLIAM H. FITTS 1964

PROFILE SHEET

Clinical and Research Form
PUBLISHED BY:
COUNSELOR RECORDINGS AND TESTS
BOX 6104 ACKLEN STA
NASHVILLE, TENN. 37212

NAME | SCHOOL GRADE | SEX M F | AGE | DATE | TOTAL TIME

T SCORE | SELF CRITICISM | T/F | CONFLICT: NET, TOTAL | TOTAL | POSITIVE SCORES: ROW 1 2 3, COLUMN A B C D E | PERCENTILE SCORES | VARIABILITY: TOTAL, COL TOT., ROW TOT. | DISTRIBUTION: D 5 4 3 2 1 | EMPIRICAL SCALES: DP GM PSY PD N PI | NDS | T SCORE

99.99
99.9
99
95
90
80
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
5
1

Pretest _____

Posttest -----

Figure 11. Group Mean
Non Video

Tennessee Self Concept Scale

PROFILE SHEET

Clinical and Research Form

PUBLISHED BY:
[illegible] LOR [illegible] GS AR[illegible]
[illegible] ACKE[illegible]
NASHVILLE, TENN. 37212

NAME | SCHOOL GRADE | SEX M F | AGE | DATE | TOTAL TIME

T SCORE | SELF CRITICISM | T/F | CONFLICT: NET, TOTAL | TOTAL | POSITIVE SCORES: ROW 1 2 3, COLUMN A B C D E | PERCENTILE SCORES | VARIABILITY: TOTAL, COL. TOT., ROW TOT. | DISTRIBUTION: D 5 4 3 2 1 | EMPIRICAL SCALES: DP GM PSY PD N PI | NDS | T SCORE

99.99
99.9
99
95
90
80
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
5
1

PROFILE LIMITS
UP 16 7 29 44 14 11
DOWN 29 9 24 17 9 24

34 19 24 34 14 29 14 22 9 19
24 29 18 39 17 34 21 17 14 15

Pretest _____

Posttest -------

Figure 12. Group Mean Control